

C A S E

O F T H E

Episcopal Clergy

And of THOSE of the

Episcopal Perswasion,

Considered, as to the granting them a

TOLERATION & INDULGENCE,

T By George Gordon

 THE SECOND PART.

In a Letter to Mr. *George Meldrum* Professor of Theology in the
 Colledge of *Edinburgh*.

Being a Vindication of the former, from the Misrepresentations
 of the *Remarks, &c.*

-
- I. Cor: IV. 10. "We are fools for Christ's sake, but ye are wise in Christ: we are weak, but ye are strong: ye are honourable, but we are despised.
 11. Even unto this present hour, we both hunger and thirst, and are naked, and are buffeted, and have no certain dwelling place.
 12. And labour, working with our hands: being reviled, we bless; being persecuted, we suffer it.
 13. Being defamed, we intreat: we are made as the filth of the world, and are the off-scouring of all things unto this day.
 14. I write not these things to shame you.

Mr: *John Corbet* in his *Remains*, p: 1691: I consent to Bishop *Usher's* Model of Government by Arch-Bishops and Bishops with their Presbyters.

Printed in the Year 1704.

CASS E

OF THE

Episcopal Clergy

And of those of the

Episcopal Clergy

Constituted in the

TOLERATION & INDULGENCE



In a Letter to the

Right Reverend

Archbishop of Canterbury

By the Right Reverend

Bishop of London

And the Right Reverend

Bishops of Exeter and Bath

And the Right Reverend

Bishops of Winchester and Gloucester

Printed in the Year 1774

Reverend S I R,

HAVING Occasion to look upon your *Vindication and Defence* of your Sermon preached May 16. 1703. I was not a little surpriz'd to see the Esteem you seem to have of the Pamphlet called the *Remarks upon the Case of the Episcopal Clergy*, &c. So as in the 2d. Page of your Defence to refer to it, as Vindicating sufficiently what hath been said against the Toleration desired. And in the 5th. Page you say, *That which others object anent Baptism and the Lords Supper is sufficiently answered by the Gentlemans Letter and the Remarks upon the Case.* And P. 23. as to the Controversy about Prelacy, and the Original and Institution thereof; how inconcludent the Arguments from the Old Testament, and the Order of Priests, or the Apostles office in the New Testament, or the Instances of Timothy and Titus, and the Angels of the Seven Churches, are; hath, you say, been often evidenced and briefly, tho' very clearly and solidly, by the Author of the Remarks on the Case &c.

The Remarks are reputed, by such unbiass'd Persons as have lookt into them, so *Scurrilous* a Pamphlet, wherein the Author discovers so much of disingenuity, falsehood, ignorance, shuffling, and impudent and unseemly railing and banter, that I was perswaded they would meet with no regard but from the *Mob* of the party, whom nothing pleases so much as bold revilings of others, and confident assertions, tho' backt with nothing of Truth or reason: And therefore I judg'd it as incongruous to give any reply to them, as for a sober man to answer the Revilings of a Scold, who attacks him with her Tongue upon the Streets, to whom the most prudent return is silently to pass by, and to take no notice of them. But when I perceived, that you thought fit to give reputation to the Remarks, and to vouch their Authority, I judg'd it would not be impertinent calmly to expostulate with you about them, and to consider if they

are worthy of the Regard and Character which you have been pleased to give them. The Remarks are written indeed with such an Air of Confidence, and such open defiance given to the World, that one at first would be tempted to think the Author of them had the truth on his side, or at least that he judged so; but when the contrary is so manifest, they look like one that resolves to out-face the Sun, and to bid open defiance to the world to prove there is Light, when the Sun shines.

Before I touch the particulars about which you refer to him, give me leave to mention some gross mistakes, which if they proceed from want of Capacity, or of Candour and ingenuity, I leave you to determine.

One of his Arts is to pass over all that is material in a Paragraph, and to nibble at some words, and that he may make them seem absurd, he forces on them his own Interpretation, without regarding the scope and series of the Discourse, which would serve abundantly to clear them. Of this his first Remark is a palpable Instance. in the 4th. Page of the Case it is said, *That our Lord us'd no Method of Constraint to draw men in to be his Disciples, nor yet to hold them when they were his Disciples. When many left him because of some saying of his which they did not relish, he gave them free liberty, and opened the Door to let the Twelve go too, if they pleas'd, will ye also leave me? And their stay with him was from a free and willing Choice, To whom should we go, for thou hast the words of Eternal Life?* Now all the Remarker does is to catch at the Phrase: he opened the door to let the twelve go too & to make the meaning to be; *that he took off all obligation upon them to stay, and made it Lawful for them to leave him*; whereas any body may see the meaning to be, that he would not so much as constrain the twelve to stay with him, if it was not their free and willing Choice. Tho, it may be, a representation to the high Court of the Sanhedrim, against those who left him would have met with little regard, yet he could have called for fire to come down from heaven to consume these who had left him, and thereby bolted the door to keep in the twelve: and so the sense of the expression may easily be found without the Remarkers unreasonable interpretation. Whither this his first Remark then proceeded from want of sense or ingenuity, I leave you to judge.

The

The second Remark is no less beside the purpose. In the 5th page of the *Case* it is said, "that it was the will of *Jesus Christ* that all his Church throughout all Nations should be one; and the Resemblances made use of in the holy Scriptures of one City and one Living Body being adduc'd, it was said that no particular street or precinct must make the Terms, either of enjoying the priviledges of the City, or of bearing particular offices in it, narrower or other than the master builder himself has made them. And that the Unity of his Church is not like that of a heap of Stones, thrown together by force, but as lively Stones built up into a spiritual house by the Cement of Love and Charity; nor like that of a skeleton, only fastened together by wires, but as a living body animated with a living Spirit, speaking the Truth in Love, and receiving all its influences from the head &c. Now to the Episcopal Clergy, the practice of the Presbyterian builders seems contrary to both these, they require other terms for enjoying the priviledges of Christian Society, and for bearing office in it, than *Jesus Christ* required, as shall hereafter be made appear in this paper, and they lay the great stress of holding up the body of a Church upon the outward wires and weights; as appears from the Representation of the Commission of the General Assembly to the last Session of Parliament. Your Friend the Remarker passes over all this, and carps only at another Reasoning drawn from the same similitudes P. 6. of the *Case*, and founded on the Holy Scriptures; That our Lord in the edifying of his Body, has not given all the same Office, nor established a perfect Parity among the Builders, but made some Apostles, some Prophets, some Evangelists, some Pastors & Teachers &c. The Remarker says, 'This is to assert what none will deny. He grants there is an Imparity among the office bearers of different kinds, the extraordinary & the ordinary, & of the last the Pastor has place and Dignity above the ruling Elder, and both above the Deacon; and as every Pastor is subject to his bretheren, so the lesser Judicatories of the Church are subject to the greater in a comely order; but that it is as unscriptural to introduce an imparity among office bearers of the same kind, such as the Ministers of the Word and Sacraments, as an inequality between members of the same kind in the Natural Body is preternatural. And he says, that men of sense and discretion will loath such jugling and disingenuous hand-

ling of matters, as he would have the Writer of the *Case* guilty of. Sir, Where the juggling lyes, I leave to the Impartial Reader to judge. The Argument and reasoning is S. Paul's 1. Cor. 12. and Eph. 4. The Remarker grants an Imparity among Office-bearers of different kinds, but not of the same rank and dignity; and that the Pastor is above the ruling Elder, and both above the Deacon. Now the history of the New Testament, and primitive Antiquity tells us of three Degrees of Office-bearers in the Church, Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons, and all of them consecrated to the service of God and empower'd to preach the Gospel, but not a syllable of the Lay-ruling Elders and Deacons, of which the Remarker speaks; and for the Judicatories of Presbyteries, Synods and General Assemblies and the subjection of the one to the other by Divine right and Institution, your Brethren, I hope, are more ingenuous than to pretend a Divine warrant for it. And that Imparity and Subordination even among Office-bearers of the same kind is not so unscriptural, as the Remarker would have it, appears from 1. Chr. 24. Ezra. 8. Numb. 3.

Pray, Sir, upon what ground does the Remarker in his 7. Rem. accuse the Author of the *Case* of Charging P. 7. *the Reformed Churches with a Schism, and that a Lamentable one.* For in the last §. of that page of the *Case*, after it is said [that as the Church had this Government, (viz. by Bishops, and Presbyters and Deacons) in the times which were purest for Religion, so it continued to be the Government of the Church for 1500 years.] it is added [after which time that Lamentable Schism happening that hath miserably divided the western parts of the Catholick Church; the Protestants did not without reason, lay the blame of it upon the Church of Rome their imposing Conditions of Communion, which were not required by the primitive Church, nor instituted by Christ or his Apostles &c.] Where does the Author charge the Reformers with the Schism? Is there any Protestant who will say there is not a Lamentable Schism in the Church? The Protestants affix the Guilt of it upon the Church of Rome, the Author of the *Case* says they had reason so to do, and what shadow of pretence is there for this wilful Calumny, that he charges the Reformed Churches with it?

And what do you think of his Sincerity in affirming with such an Air of Confidence Rem. 8. that the *Superintendents* were never honoured

noured to be Moderators of the Assembly, when the contrary is so evident, not only from the Records of the Assemblies, but even, from the Presbyterian Historians, particularly Mr. *Petrie*. The Commission of the General Assembly, having sit all the time of this last Session of Parliament to advert (as they say in their *Representation*) to the interest of the Church on every occasion; This made people think that no publick papers of this Nature came abroad without their allowance, but this, in my opinion, is a presumption to the Contrary, tho one would think the Brethren were concern'd both in Conscience and Honour not to recommend Pamphlets wherein such palpable untruths were advanced with such an Air of Confidence.

And where *Sir*, is the impudent malice which p. 7. he Charges the Author of the Case with, for saying that the Presbyterian Ministers have thrown the *Lords Prayer* out of their publick Devotions? Is it, because they have not made an express Act of the Gen. Ass. forbidding the use of it, and because the use of it is recommended in the Directory? You know better than I, that the *Directory* is not a part of your present establishment, that the Directory was never recommended in a General Assembly since the Revolution, nor any body blam'd for not observing the rules of it; that not it, but the *present practice*, is now appointed to be the *rule of uniformity of worship* among the Presbyterians; that the keeping the Lord's Prayer out of the publick Devotions is the present general practice. I would gladly know when it was heard from a Presbyterian Minister's mouth, in *Edinburgh, Dundee, Aberdeen, Glasgow*, or any other remarkable Town in *Scotland*; Or if it has ever been recommended by Presbytery, Synod, or Gen: Ass: since the Revolution: Or the Ministers blam'd by the Ass: for not using it; Yea some received among you were blamed by their Brethren, for continuing the Use of it for some time, and that upon the point of Uniformity, so that they were constrained to leave it off. This is a Variation from the former practice of the Presbyterians: For when the leading Remonstrators in the West of *Scotland* began to disuse it, the Gen: Ass. wrote a Letter charging them with Innovation, and intreating them to return to a better Mind. And with what Reason, pray, does the Remarker speak of it as a *false Insinuation, that the Presbyterians pretend it is unwarrantable to use that Form*, since they declare themselves

selves against the use of any Set Forms of Prayer: and he himself strives to disprove the Warrant for it, (boasting p. 38. that the Author of the *Case* thought fit to take no notice of it) saying "It can no more be evinced that we are commanded to use these words precisely, when we pray, from that of *Luke*, *When ye pray, say Our Father*, &c. than he can evince that Ministers are commanded always, when they Preach, to say *The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand*, in express terms, from that of *Matthew*, *And as ye go, preach, saying, the kingdom of Heaven is at hand*. The Disparity here is very great: Our Lord sends his Apostles; and after that, his Seventy Disciples, to prepare the way before him, to call the *Jews* to Repentance, and to tell them the Kingdom of God was at hand. This was to be the subject of their Preaching. This was also the subject of the Preaching of *John the Baptist*, and of our Lord himself: *Repent, for the kingdom of Heaven is at hand*. The kingdom of God, the Preaching of the Gospel by God manifested in the Flesh was come unto them; and therefore in one Sense it was peculiar to their Mission at that time; but after his Resurrection, He bids them "Go teach all Nations, teaching them, says He, to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, S. *Matth.* xxviii. 20. And wherever they went to preach the Gospel, they had reason also to make this the subject of their Preaching, that the Kingdom of God was come unto them. But as to this Form of Prayer, His Disciples desired *he would teach them to pray, as John also taught his Disciples*; and He said unto them, *When ye pray, say, Our Father, &c.* S. *Luke* xi. Again in His Sermon on the Mount, S. *Matth.* vi. when he forbids them *to use vain Repetitions as the Heathen do, who think they shall be heard for their much speaking*, He again teaches them the same Prayer. The Presbyterians grant that it is the most perfect form of prayer, that it is the most perfect pattern of all Prayers, and this proves to a demonstration that it ought to be used, being the most Excellent and Divine Prayer: ought we not to say it? because Christ put it in our mouths, because it is the marrow and abstract of all other Prayers: because we need it to redress the imperfections of all our other prayers, because of its universality as to all purposes, persons, times and places; because it is said by all the Churches in the World, and it is fit to bear a part in such a general Harmony, and this

this is a more becoming *uniformity* than for the *Scots* Presbyterians to Canton themselves into a Sect, and to make this *difformity* a peculiar badge and *Test* of their party, whereby to distinguish themselves from all other Christians in the World. What do you think of the manner of *Abr. Scultetus* his Prayer, when he preached before the Synod of *Dort*? He ushered in his *Parænesis* thus: [*Decretum mihi est &c.* 'I am resolved to stir up our Minds to the earnest prosecution of this holy work which we are going about, which that it may be profitably done, we will implore the Grace of our Heavenly Father in those words which his well beloved Son our only Saviour has said before us; *Our Father &c.*'] What will your Brethren say to this example of *bidding prayer*, before a Synod of such Orthodox and unexceptionable Divines? must the Preacher and all the Reverend Synodists pass for Punies in Divinity, or meer Babes in Religion, whom God had not favoured with the Spirit of prayer. Sir, you know how earnestly *S. Cyprian* recommends the use of the Lords Prayer, in *Serm. de Orat. Dom.* *Qua enim magis spiritualis potest esse Oratio, quam qua a Christo nobis data est &c.* What more Spiritual prayer can there be, saith he, than that which is given us by Christ, by whom also the holy Spirit is sent us? What more true prayer to the Father than that which is pronounced from his mouth by the Son, who is the Truth? So that to pray otherwise than he taught, is not only ignorance, but a Sin, since he has declared and said: Yee reject the Commandment of God, that ye may establish your own Tradition. Let us pray therefore, beloved brethren, as God our Master hath taught us. It is a friendly and familiar Prayer to ask God in his own words, and to make Christs Prayer ascend into his Ears. Let the Father hear his own Sons words when we pray to him. He who dwells inwardly in our hearts, let him be also in our Voice. And seeing we have him an Advocate with the Father for our Sins; Let us do it in the words of our Advocate. For, since he says, whatsoever ye ask the Father in my Name, it shall be given you: how much more effectually shall we obtain what we ask in the name of Christ, if we ask it by his Prayer.] Thus far *S. Cyprian*. It was said in the Postscript to the *Case*, that our Saviours commanding us to Say, *Our Father &c.* seemed to be as good a warrant for the use of that Divine form of Prayer, as *David* and other Holy men their penning of the

the Psalms is a warrant to sing Praises unto God in those Psalms, and those only. To this the remarker gives no Reply. *Quid admittit in nos Dominus Jesus* (saith Dr. Forbes in his *Irenic*. Lib. 2. n. 22.) *ut Orationem ab illo compositam, & nobis ad dicendum traditam, dicere refugiamus?* what evil hath our Lord *Jesus* done us, that we shun to say the Prayer composed by him, & recommended to be said by us? The Presbyterians grant it to be the best Pattern, but we want to know, in what sense they use it as a Pattern in their general practice.

But I come to consider the particulars wherein you commend the Remarks. You say *the Author of them has very clearly and solidly evidenced how inconcludent the Arguments are for Prelacy and the Original and Institution thereof, which are brought from the Old Testament and the Order of Priests, or the Apostles Office in the New Testament, or the Instances of Timothy and Titus, and the Angels of the seven Churches,*

In the *Case*, p. 6. 7. it is said 'That so far as Divine Records go, it is evident that there was an Imparity of Office bearers in the Church of God. That it was so under the Old Testament cannot be denied. That our Saviour instituted a difference of Offices in his Church & not a Parity, is evident from the Gospel &c. Now the Remarker says nothing as to the Argument from Imparity under the Old Testament, and from our Saviours own practice under the New; which makes me think it the more strange you should say, he had very clearly and solidly evinced how inconcludent it is, Yet the Argument from both deserves some Consideration. The former part of it is indeed very clearly and solidly enforced by the Reverend Archbishop Usher in his *Original of Bishops*: where he shews that the Government of the Church in the Old Testament was committed to the Priests and Levites, unto whom the Ministers of the New do now succeed; in like sort as our Lords day hath done unto their Sabbath; that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the Prophet touching the vocation of the Gentiles, *Isa. 66. 21. I will take of them for Priests and for Levites saith the Lord.* That the Priests were superiour to the Levites no man doubteth; and that there was not a Parity either betwixt the Priests or betwixt the Levites themselves, is manifest by the word of God, wherein mention is made of
the

the Heads and Rulers both of the one and of the other : 1. *Chron.* 24. 6, 31. and *Ezra.* 8. 29. *Numb.* 3. 24, 30, 32, 35. The *Levites* were distributed into three Families, and over each of them God appointed a Ruler. The *Priests* were divided into four and twenty Courses, 1. *Chron.* 24. who likewise had their heads, who in the History of the New Testament are ordinarily called the chief Priests, *Math.* 2. 4. and 27. 1. and clearly distinguished from that singular one, who was the Type of our Great high Priest, *that is passed into the Heavens, Jesus the Son of God.* (*Heb.* 4. 14.) Yea in the XI. of *Nehemiah* there are two named Bishops, the one of the Priests, the other of the Levites, that dwelt in *Jerusalem*, *Verses* 14, and 24. And the *Hebrew* word of the same Original in the Old Testament (*Psal.* 109. 8.) is rendred by the Greek *ἐπισκοπος* in the New (*Act.* 1. 20.) Of *Levi* it was said by *Moses* the Man of God (*Deut.* 33, 10.) *They shall teach Jacob thy Judgements and Israel thy Law; they shall put incense before thee, and whole burnt sacrifice upon thine Altar.* Now the former part of their Office was nor Typical, but still to be continued in the Church of God, yea and the latter part also, tho in so far as it was Typical it ceased with them, (the truth prefigured thereby being exhibited) yet in one Spiritual sense (in so far as the incense and Sacrifice of the peoples joynt Prayers and Praises were to be offered up unto God by his Ministers through *Jesus Christ* our high Priest) this part of their Office was likewise to be perpetual in the Church.

With what shew of reason then can any man imagine that what was instituted by God in the Law, for meer matter of Government and preservation of good Order (without respect of Type or Ceremony) should now be rejected in the Gospel as a Device of Antichrist?

Now pray, Sir, consider impartially (without studying to please the humour of a party) this reasoning of so learned and pious a Man, and see if your Friend has clearly and solidly evinc'd how inconcludent it is. Remember the matter in debate among us is not, whether the Offices of Bishops and Presbyters be distinct Orders, or different degrees of the same Order, as you would seem to insinuate p. 23 of your *Vindication*, and the *Remarker* likewise, for that is wholly beside the purpose, and tossed only among the Schoolmen ; nor if

the same names were at first common to both (as you will grant according to your scheme of Government, that the name *Presbyter* or *Elder* was at first common both to Preaching Pastors, and to unpreaching *Lay Elders*; but now you have appropriated the name of *Elders* only to the last; nor if the same qualifications were required in both, and in many things the same work and duty enjoined; nor is the main question concerning Diocesan Bishops; but whether an *Imparity* of Pastors, a Superiority of some Office-bearers above preaching Presbyters, be in the Church of Christ unlawful and Antichristian. For this you know has been now for these many years, the distinguishing principle of Scots Presbyterians, and which they affirm they have sworn in their Solemn Covenants. Now such an *Imparity*, we see, is not unlawful in its own Nature: it was instituted by God himself in his Church under the Old Testament; it was not merely Typical; their Offices of Teaching Gods Law, and of going before the People in praying to God, were to be perpetual. God spoke by his Prophet of the Gentiles under the Gospel; *I will take of them for Priests and for Levites, saith the Lord.* The *Imparity*, we see, is a matter of Government, and for preservation of good order. People then had need to have full evidence that such an *Imparity* among preaching Pastors in the Church, is contrary to the Gospel of *Jesus Christ*, before they Father it upon Antichrist, and enter into solemn Covenants against it.

Now it was said in the *Case* p. 6. "That it is evident from the Gospel, that our Saviour instituted an *Imparity* among the Pastors of his Church, He choose out among his Disciples seventy to whom he gave power to Teach and to Baptize; he choose out also Twelve Apostles, and sent them forth to Preach the Kingdom of God. To this the *Remarker* sayes nothing. The *Twelve* were above the 70 in Priviledges, in Gifts, in the power of their dispensation, in Commission. The 70 were labourers in the work of the Gospel, these were Master-builders. *Philip* preached, Converted, and Baptized the *Samaritans*, yet till *Peter* and *John* came down and Prayed, and laid their Hands on them, they received not the Holy Ghost. *Act. 8.* When one Room fell void among the Twelve by the Treason of *Judas*, it must, by the direction of the Spirit of God, be made up by an election out of the 70. And *S. Paul* we see who had not been an im-

me-

[11]

mediate witness of Christ's Life, and Resurrection is yet afterwards assumed amongst the Apostles. Now if our Blessed Saviour thought it fit to found his Church in an evident Imparity, what reason can there be to imagine he did not intend so to continue it?

To say this was *Extraordinary*, and not to be observed in after ages in the Church, is to affirm that which the Scripture has not said. Do we think it would have been agreeable to Gods word if under the Old Testament, long after *Moses* his time, some of the *Levites* and certain of the Children of *Israel*, should have gathered themselves together against the Priests and said: Yee take too much upon you? The Superiority that was in *Moses* his time was *extraordinary* and not to be continued. This attempt we see was made in *Moses* his time. *Korah and his company say to Moses and Aaron, you take too much upon you, seeing all the Congregation are holy every one of them, and the Lord is among them. Wherefore then lift you up yourselves above the Congregation of the Lord?* And *Moses* said to *Korah*, *Hear, I pray you, yee Sons of Levi, seemeth it a smal thing to you that the God of Israel hath separated you from the Congregation of Israel to bring you near to himself to do the service of the Tabernacle, and to stand before the Congregation to minister to them? And seek ye the Priesthood also? And what is Aaron that ye murmur against him?* Now our Lord, while he was upon Earth, having also made an Imparity among his Church Officers and Ministers, to rise up against this, and thrust it out of his Church, because all the *Levites* are Holy, and out of a pretence that what he did was *extraordinary*, and not to be continued, is to write after *Korah's* Copy. Where the Reasons of a thing remain the institution must remain too. There were somethings in the Office of the Apostles extraordinary, other things to be perpetual thro' all ages. To be the Immediate witnesses of his Resurrection was peculiar to them and to that age. But to preach the Gospel by word and deed, to train up others for the same Office, to commit it unto Faithful Men, to Ordain them to it, to oversee, not the people only, but their immediate Pastors also, and when every one had their work assigned them, then as the *Porter to watch*, was to be perpetual, and to be continued in the Church thro' all Ages. For the reasons of these things are perpetual.

In the *Case* p. 6. it is said 'That after our Lords Ascension the Apostles continued an Imparity of Office-bearers in his Church. The Apostle Paul settled Timothy at Ephesus and Titus in Crete to ordain Elders or Pastors in every City. Now the Remarker denies that these were ever settled in any Church: he sayes, they were Evangelists, and travelled from Church to Church as the Apostles directed them (Rem. 3.) and that they were extraordinary Officers.

As the Apostles ordained Elders in every City, so they committed power to others, as we see to Timothy and Titus to do the like, and to charge them what Doctrine to Preach. I. Tim. 1. 3. They gave them directions what sort of men they should ordain to the Sacred Office. I Tim. 4. Tit. 1. 5. how to censure them. I. Tim. 5. Now we do not read in all the Scriptures that they committed this power to the particular Presbyters in a City, to ordain other Presbyters. As to that of I. Tim. 1. 14. You know Calvin expounds it of the Gift of Eldership conferred upon him by the laying on of hands. And Chrysostom on the place expressly affirms that it is not to be understood of Presbyters, but of Bishops; for Presbyters, saith he, did not ordain Timothy. For II. Tim. 1. 6. S. Paul sayes, *stir up the gift of God which is in thee by the putting on of my Hands.*

To say that this was an Extraordinary Office, because the Apostle calls Timothy an Evangelist (II. Tim. 4. 5.) is without ground. What is it to do the work of an Evangelist but to preach the Gospel? and it seems to be a name applyed to all who preached the Gospel. As we find Philip preaching the word of God in Samaria, Act. 8. 5. called an Evangelist, Act. 21. 8. And yet was one of the Seven, meaning Deacons, Act. 6. 5. Now why might not Timothy be called an Evangelist, preaching the word, being a Bishop; as Philip was for the same cause named an Evangelist, being a Deacon.

Besides, the Office which is said to have been that of an Evangelist was to preach and plant the Gospel where it was not already. But Timothy & Titus were appointed by Paul to order and govern Churches already planted. And the precepts given them do not refer to the Temporary power of Evangelists, but have respect to the perpetual power of Bishops and Overseers of Churches. Thus Scultetus a member of the Synod of Dort reasons in his observations on the Epistle to Titus [*ac Paulus Ephesi & in Creta aliquamdiu docuerat &c.* For, saith

[13]

'saith he, *Paul* had for sometime taught both in *Ephesus* & *Crete*. He commands therefore *Timothy* to abide in *Ephesus*, and *Titus* in *Crete*, not as Evangelists, but as Rulers of the Church, which appears also from the Epistles writted to each of them. For in these he does not set down the way how to gather a Church, which is the Office of Evangelists, but how to govern a Church already gathered, which is the Office of a Bishop. And all the precepts are so ordered, as that they do not refer particularly to *Timothy* and *Titus*; but generally to all Bishops, and so do not at all agree with the temporary power of Evangelists.

Beza also, in his Notes on *I. Tim.* 5. 27. sayes; 'The Apostle, by these Canons he prescribes, directs how he who presides in the College of Elders, that is of Pastors and Overseers of Discipline, should behave himself towards them.

To affirm then, That there is no shadow of Reason for saying, that *Paul* settled *Timothy* at *Ephesus*, and *Titus* at *Crete*, to have the peculiar Oversight of those Churches, is to speak without Reason. The Directions he gives them, implying the Duty of a continual Care & Inspection of those Churches. And this doth not hinder, but that before, and even sometimes after, they might have gone to other places to plant and confirm Churches; *These things write I unto thee*, saith *S. Paul*, *1. Tim.* iii. 14. 15. *hoping to come unto thee shortly; But if I tarry long; that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thy self in the house of God.* As to what the Remarker says, that they travelled from Church to Church as the Apostles directed them, (they were under the direction of one of the Apostles *S. Paul*,) and that he must be a stranger to the Bible that knows not they were found as frequently in others, as in that, where it is pretended the Apostles settled them. Sir, I doubt not but you will conclude him to be a greater stranger to the History of the Bible, and the Chronology of it, who knows not the most of all this was before the time of their being settled at *Ephesus* and *Crete*, and *S. Paul* his directing his Epistles to them thither. The learned *Gerard*, the *Lutheran*, speaks to better purpose in *Tom. 6. de Minister. Eccles. num. 127.* [*In illorum Evangelistarum numero &c.*] 'Among those Evangelists, saith he, we may reckon *Timothy* and *Titus*. *Paul* took *Timothy* along with him at *Lystra*, *Act. 16.* Thereafter he sent him into *Macedonia*.

C

Ad.

'Ad. 19. 22. to Corinth, 1. Cor. 4. 17. To Philippi, Phil. 2. 19. To Thes-
 salonica. Thess. 1. 1. 3. at length he is settled Bishop of the Church of
 Ephesus. Titus his fellow helper, 1. Cor. 8. 23. he sends to Corinth.
 II. Cor. 12. 18. takes him with him to Jerusalem. Gal. 2. 1. and at
 length settles him Bishop of the Church of Crete. We have also the
 Testimony of the Antient Fathers to confirm this Truth. Eusebius
 Eccl. hist. L. 3. C. 4. tells us, that Timothy was settled by Paul,
 Bishop in Ephesus, and Titus was by him set over the Churches in Crete,
 Jerom in Catal. Script. Eccl. C. 10. writes, that Timothy was or-
 dained Bishop of Ephesus by the Blessed Paul. and C. 12. that Titus
 was Bishop of Crete. And in the fourth General Council, at Chalcedon,
 Leontius Bishop of Magnesia gave a list of 27 Bishops of Ephesus from
 Timothy till that time. S. Chrysostom in his preface to his Hom. on 1.
 Tim. gives this reason why S. Paul wrote only to Timothy and Titus,
 and not to Luke and Silas, and his other Disciples and Companions,
viz. That he had delivered to them the Care and Government of the
 Church, but he took the rest still along with him in his Travels. And
 on Titus 3. 12. When I shall send Artemas unto thee or Tychicus,
 be diligent to come unto me to Nicopolis: for I have determined there
 to winter. He says, ['what means this, when you have already
 'set him over an Island, and now you call him back again? I do
 'not this, saith he, that I may remove him from his Office and Mi-
 'nist'ry, but that he may return from me better fitted and instructed
 'for it. And that you may know that he does not call for him, to
 'carry him about with him, and be his companion, hear what follows:
 'For I have determined there to Winter.] And thereafter on V. 13.
 Bring Zenas the Lawyer and Apollos on their journey diligently;
 He says: ['To these the care of Church Government was
 'not as yet committed, but they were only his Companions
 'in his Travels] So that for the Remarker to bid open defiance
 to the World (Rem. 3.) to prove that ever the Apostles set-
 tled Timothy or Titus in any Church, shews only the Vanity of his
 Temper, and with what reason the Apostle cautions the said Timo-
 thy to beware of admitting into the Pastoral Office, *one that is a No-
 vice* (1. Tim. 3. 6.) As for the Postscripts of these Epistles, no
 thing had been said of them in the Case; and for his Learned Mr.
 Prynne I leave him to be considered by himself; for perhaps the
 Learning, Reason and discretion of both may be near a kin; and
 with-

without any reproach, either to the men or the cause assaulted by him; no answer may have been given him, as being worthy of none.

In the *Gloss*, P. 6. it was said that in *Rev. 2.* and *3.* tho' in *Ephesus* and the rest of the seven Churches there were more than one Elder or Pastor in every Church, yet Christ directs to one that had the chief care of every Church &c. As to this, your Friends Remark has as little of clearness and solidity as the former. *Augustin* says no where, that those Angels are not to be understood of single persons, but as signifying a collective Body. In his 162. *Epistle* he says: *Divina voce laudatur Angeli nomine prepositus Ecclesia.* And as for *Tatian* he never once mentions the thing. And to his one *Perkins*, the generality of all Commentators, both Antient and Modern, may be opposed.

Ambrose on 1. *Cor. 1.* I call, saith he, the Bishops Angels, as *John* teacheth in the Revelation. *Scultetus* in his observations upon *Titus* saith: The most learned Interpreters understand by the seven Angels of the Churches the seven Bishops of those Churches, neither can they do otherwise without straining the Text. *Beza* on *Rev. 2.* 1. The Angel, saith he, is the President [*Negus*] who must be admonished, and by him his Colleagues and so the whole Church. *Rainolds* in his conference with *Hart* C. 8. §. 3. Tho', saith he, in the Church of *Ephesus* there were many Presbyters and Pastors for the Administration of it, yet there was one who presided over these many, whom our Saviour calls the Angel of the Church, and to him he writes these things which the rest might learn from him. *Bullinger* in *Epist. ad Smyrn.* The heavenly Epistle, saith he, is directed to the Angel of the Church of *Smyrna*, that is to the Pastor. Now the Histories testify that this Angel, or Pastor of the Church of *Smyrna* was *Polycarp*, who was ordained Bishop by the Apostles. I mean by *John* himself, and lived in the Ministry of that Church 86 years. Thus you know very well that the Interpreters generally are not of your Remarker's opinion, no not *Beza* himself: And the Remarker's Argument, that the singular Term should there be understood Collectively, because in some sentences there is a Transition from the singular number to the plural [as, to you and to the rest in *Thyatira* &c. And to the Angel of *Smyrna*; The Devil will cast some of you into Prison] is sufficiently expos'd and baffled, (as is all he has said

said upon the subject of Church Government) by the Learned Author of *Imparity among Pastors*, where he shews how our Lord sayes, *S. Luke 22. 31. 32. Simon, Simon; Satan hath desired to have you that he may sift you as wheat, but I have prayed for thee &c.* in which there is a Transition from the singular, *Simon*, to the Plural *you*; and yet the singular is not to be taken collectively, as signifying a multitude of men or Apostles, but only one Man, or one Apostle; and accordingly, immediatly he says to him, *I have prayed for thee &c.* And as to the *Remarkers* Questions about *Lights* and *Candle-sticks*, I answer one Star, as the Apostle tells us, differs from another Star in Glory, and so *Jesus Christ* may speak to one Pastor in name of all the rest of that Church, he having the Oversight of, and being accountable for them. And why they should be addressed to as one single Person, is not upon any other principle easy to be accounted for.

It is said in the *Case P. 7.* 'That there cannot be a greater evidence that these were not extraordinary Officers (mentioned in the Divine Records) but were to continue by succession in all Ages, than the practice of the whole Church, immediatly from the Apostles times; there being in every Church such an Order and Imparity settled of *Bishops, Presbyters* and *Deacons*, with a due subordination to one another, all consecrated to the service of God, &c. What greater evidence can there be that such an Imparity of Pastours, as we read of, in the Divine Records of the *New Testament*, was not extraordinary, than that it was continued throughout the Catholick Church, without interruption from that time downwards? What more convincing proof, that the Angels to whom the Epistles in the *Revelation* are directed, were the *Bishops* of the seven Churches, than the writings of the *Fathers* about these times who mention the particular Bishops that governed these Churches? For Instance *Irenaeus adversus haereses* L. 3. C. 3. speaks thus, you know, concerning *Polycarp* Bishop of *Smyrna*: '*Polycarp*, saith he, was not only train'd up by the Apostles, and conversed with many of those who saw our Lord, but he was also settled Bishop of the Church which is in *Smyrna* by the Apostles in *Asia*, whom likewise I saw in my younger years. For he lived long, and being very old departed this life suffering a glorious and noble Martyrdom. The Brethren of the Church

Church of Smyrna, in their Epistle concerning his Martyrdom, say of him: 'He was the most admirable man in our times, an Apostolical and Prophetical Doctor and Bishop of the Catholick Church, which is in *Smyrna*. *Tertullian* in his Book of *Prescriptions* against *Hereticks* C. 32. saith; That as the Church of *Smyrna* had *Polycarp* plac'd there by *John*, and the Church of *Rome* *Clement* ordained by *Peter*, so the rest of the Churches also did shew what Bishops they had received, by the appointment of the Apostles, to transmit the Apostolical seed unto them. And so before him did *Ireneus* urge against the *Hereticks* L. 4. adv. *Heret.* C. 63. the successions of Bishops unto whom the Apostles committed the charge of the Church in every place. And L. 3. C. 3. "We are able, saith he, to number those who by the Apostles, were ordained Bishops in the Churches, and their Successors unto our days. To whom also they committed those Churches, and whom they left Successors, delivering to them their place of Government [*Magisterii.*] But because it would be very long to reckon up the Successions of all the Churches. ----- The Blessed Apostles then, [*Peter* and *Paul*] founding the Church of *Rome*, committed the Bishoprick of that Church to *Linus*: *Paul* makes mention of this *Linus* in his Epistles to *Timothy*. To him *Anacletus* succeeded; after him *Clemens* got the Bishoprick, the third after the Apostles, who did both see the Apostles and conferred with them. To this *Clement*, succeeded *Euaristus*; to *Euaristus*, *Alexander*; and thereafter *Sixtus* is placed the Sixth from the Apostles; and after him *Telesphorus*, who also gloriously suffered Martyrdom; and thereafter *Hyginus*, then *Pius*, after whom *Anicetus*. And after *Soter* had succeeded to *Anicetus*, now *Elutherius* possesseth the Bishoprick, being the twelfth after the Apostles &c. Hence you see how far they are mistaken (saith the pious and Learned Dr. *Forbes* in his *Irenic.* L. 2. C. 12. prop. 11.) who say that *Ireneus* does not distinguish Bishops from simple Presbyters, tho' else where he also calls Bishops Presbyters. *Hegeſippus* who lived in the 2d. Century, next after the first Succession of the Apostles, and wrote the most Antient Ecclesiastick History, as he is cited by *Eusebius* Lib. 2. C. 23. of his Church History, sheweth that *James* the Brother of our Lord, surnamed the *Just*, did govern the Church of *Jerusalem* together with the Apostles, yet so, (as *Clement* of *Alexandria*, who

wrote some twenty years after him, further addeth) as to be chosen the peculiar Bishop of *Jerusalem*. After the death of *James the Just*, *Hegeippus* declareth, that *Simeon* the Son of *Cleophas* was constituted Bishop, and that the said *Simeon*, being 120 years of Age, suffered a glorious Martyrdom about the same time that *Ignatius* suffered, who succeeded to *Euodius* in the Bishoprick of *Antioch*, and both suffered about the tenth year of the Reign of *Trajan*. In the XIV. year of *Domitian*, about the 95 year of our Lord, *S. John* wrote his *Revelation* in the Isle of *Patmos*, and in it the Epistle directed by our Saviour to the Angel of the Church of *Philadelphia*. No longer than twelve years after that time, *Ignatius* when going to his Martyrdom at *Rome*, writeth an Epistle to the same Church, and therein delivers this as the Voice of GOD, *take heed to your Bishops and to the Presbytery, and the Deacons*, calling him to witness for whom he was bound, and for whom he went then into his last Martyrdom, that he had not this from human Flesh, (or from the mouth of men) but that the Spirit spake it: *without the Bishop do nothing*. Again *Ierom* in his Epistle to *Marcellus* sayes, *the Bishops held the place of the Apostles*. In his preface on *Mathew* he sayes, *that Mark was the first Bishop of Alexandria*. And in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastick Writers he says, *Mark the Evangelist died in the eighth year of Nero and was buried in Alexandria, Anianus succeeding him, Peter and Paul and John the Apostles being yet alive, and constituting Churches*. And in the same Book he expressly affirms, that *James was ordained Bishop of Jerusalem and Polycarp of Smyrna by the Apostles themselves*. And in the end of his Epistle to *Euagrius* he says: *And that we may know that the Apostolick Traditions are taken from the Old Testament, what Aaron, and his sons and the Levites were in the Temple, that are the Bishops and Presbyters and Deacons in the Church*.

Now Sir, The Arguments from Scripture are confirmed by the universal practice of the primitive Church, from the days of the Apostles. It is evident from the primitive Records of Antiquity, that *James*, and *Mark*, and *Timothy* and *Titus* and *Linus* and *Polycarp* were settled Bishops in *Jerusalem*, *Alexandria*, *Ephesus*, *Crete*, *Rome*, and *Smyrna* respectively by the Apostles themselves. And if as *Ierom* sayes in his Comm. on the Ep. to *Titus*; 'Before that by the Instant of the Devill, contentions fell out among Christians, and some said

(19)

'said, I am of *Paul*, and I of *Apollo* and I of *Cephas*. Churches were governed by the common Council of Presbyters; but after that every one reckon'd those whom he Baptised, to be his, and not Christs; it was decreed throughout the whole World, that one chosen from among the Presbyters should be set over the rest, to whom the Care of the whole Church should belong, and that thereby the seeds of Schisms might be taken away. Then certainly this was done in the Apostles times, and while they were yet alive: as we see those seeds of Schism began to spring in their days, as *S. Paul* tells us *1. Cor. 1.* And therefore, as reason tells us, that the Apostles would be careful to choke it in the bud, so we see the most Ancient Ecclesiastick Writers and Records, and particularly *Jerom* himself tells us they did so. It is evident also that their Presidency was constant and perpetual, and not temporary or Annual. That the care of the whole Church, over which they were constituted Bishops, was committed to them; that they ordained the Presbyters, and none were ordained without them; that in a Church every Presbyter, such as is now the Minister of a particular Parish, had not this Episcopal power, to whom both the Care of them, and of the whole Church, was committed. Laying aside then your Friends banter and his vain confidence, his bidding open defiance to the World, and his indiscreet way of treating Things and Persons; which I know, you will not take for clear and Solid Answers; I can see nothing offered by the *Remarker*, that is clear and solid, to shew how inconcludent this Reasoning is. The Divine Records shew us there was an *Imparity* and Subordination of Pastors in the Church, so far as they go. In the primitive Church we see the same *Imparity* and Subordination was settled every where without Contradiction. The Apostles themselves had not only a Superiority over the other Pastors, but they assumed others into the same power with them, committed to them the Care of Particular Churches, empowered them to ordain Presbyters, to exercise Ecclesiastick Jurisdiction over others, and that in Churches already planted, & after they had been their companions for many years, travelling from Church to Church. Our Lord directs his Epistles to the Angels of the 7 Churches. That there were single & particular persons to whom the chief care of those Churches was committed, there is as great evidence as the nature of the thing is capable of; particularly that *Polycarp* was then Bishop

Bishop of *Smyrna*, whom *Irenaeus* declares he saw in his younger years, and that he was ordained Bishop by the Apostles. I would very gladly then be inform'd by you, how this Reasoning is evinced to be inconcludent, as you say, very clearly and solidly, by the Author of the *Remarks on the Case &c.*

The *Remarker* page 6. sayes, "That Dr. *Stillingsfleet* gives an account of Churches that were governed from the beginning without Bishops, in his *Irenicum*. And p. 25. He sayes, that Dr. *Stillingsfleet* hath, in his *Irenicum*, for ever ruined the Pretensions of Episcopacy to a *Jus divinum* and p. 6. he sayes, that Dr. *Forbes* in his *Irenicum* shews that the Church of the *Albigenses* never had Bishops &c. Sir, Dr. *Forbes*, for ought I know, speaks nothing there of the *Albigenses* their never having Bishops. The only remarkable Instance adduced by him, and Dr. *Stillingsfleet* too, of a Churches having so great an economical Defect (as Dr. *Forbes* calls it) for a long time, is that of *Scotland*: *John Major* and *Fordun* affirming they had no Bishops till *Palladius's* coming into *Scotland*, Anno 430. and that they were governed from the time of their Conversion anno 263. till then, by Presbyters and Monks. Sir, You know how uncertain the Antiquities of our Scots history are, especially before the time of *Fergus* the Second, and the coming of *Palladius* into *Scotland*, and how late our Historians are, with respect to these times; so that nothing clear and solid can be built on that Testimony, to confront the Authentick evidences of so many other Churches, immediately founded by the Apostles themselves. And, but that I cannot be surprized to see the *Remarkers* confidence in any thing, I should strange to hear him say, that Dr. *Stillingsfleet* in his *Irenicum* had for ever ruined the pretensions of Episcopacy to a *jus Divinum*, for you know, Sir, that Dr. *Stillingsfleet* in his *Irenicum*, uses no Arguments against the Divine Right of Episcopacy, but those by which he levels against the Divine Right of Presbytery, or any other particular form of Church Government, as unalterably appointed; so that it seems your Friend is as much against the Divine Right of Presbytery as Episcopacy, and therefore P. 37. he will needs have the *Formula* only to require, that it be owned to be the only Government of the Church in this Kingdom established by Law.

As for Dr. *Forbes*, his sense of things may be had best from his own Writings. In his *Irenicum* Lib. 2. Cap. 12. this is his 4th.

Pro.

Proposition. By Divine right a President and Moderator is necessary to a Society or Colledge of Pastors, who being clothed with publick Authority, may call the rest, and with them exercise Ecclesiastick Judgment, ordain Pastors, Moderate meetings, Visit Churches, pronounce sentences, see them put in execution, to whom the rest are bound to submit, and to obey him in the Lord, he behaving himself aright in his station. His sixth proposition is, that it is consonant to Divine Right that this ordinary Moderator or President do not abdicat his Office or be not removed from it, except for some fault, or because of Infirmitie. In his prooff of his last proposition he says: 'This charge being given of God, and a part of the Ecclesiastick Ministry, and all ordinary Ecclesiastick Ministry, being according to Divine Institution perpetual, and seeing evcry Bishop, Presbyter, and Deacon, every one in his own station, ought to reckon that, as said to himself, which is commanded to be said to Archippus: Take heed to the Ministry which thou hast received in the Lord, that thou fulfill it. Coloss. 4. 7. And seeing the Lord says, that No man having put his hand to the Plough and looking back, is fit for the Kingdom of God. Luke 9. 62. And seeing the continued Presidency of one worthy person tends also to prevent ambition and sedition among Brethren; it is undoubtedly, he says, consonant to the Law of God and Nature, as well as to the Ecclesiastick, that a fit President nether desert his Station, nor be removed from the exercise of his Office. And for the circular whirling about, or annual Translation of the Moderating power and dignity among the brethren, it is, as he says truly, a late invention, unknown to Antiquity, and destitute of any warrand from the Holy Scriptures. And tho' when affairs are in disorder, & not yet settled, this has been taken up not impertinently by some, yet in constituted and settled Churches it ought not to be retained. In his exposition of the 4th. Proposition he says: 'The first Polity of the Christian Church was instituted by Divine Authority with some such Order and inequality among the Rulers themselves. There was ever in the Church from the beginning of it, a certain personal Authority (which we call Episcopal) having power of presiding over the Society of simple Presbyters; Christ was thus over the Apostles not only as Servants, by a Lordly Authority, and as Disciples by the Authority of a Master; but also as Presbyters, and Ministers of the word by the Episcopal Authority; for all

E

this

'this dignity and perfection was eminently conspicuous in that great
'Bishop of our Souls. Hence the Blessed Martyr *Ignatius*, in his Epistle
to the *Trallians*, warns them *to be subject to the Bishop as to Christ,*
and to the Society of Presbyters as the Apostles of Christ. 'After our
'Lords Ascension the Apostles were Superiors to the rest of the Mini-
'sters of the word. And Societies multiplying, the Apostles plac'd
'particular Bishops over the Churches, seeing they could not be pre-
'sent with, or assisting to them all. Neither were simple Presbyters
'at any time Supream Rulers in the Church (except that this per-
'haps after the Apostles times might have happened some where thro'
'an æconomical defect of some particular Church) for our Lord did
'otherwise institute the Government of the Church. Neither is
'there any *Church Government* better than that which was in the
'times of *Christ* and of the *Apostles*.

Sir, I have set down this excellent passage, both because he makes a
more becoming use of our Saviour & his Apostles their *practice & Institu-*
tion than to say it was but temporary & extraordinary, & not to be con-
tinued in the Church; & for that it gives us a true *Idea* of the best Church
Government of Christs own Institution. Our Lord the great Bishop and
Pastor of our Souls did not only *Preach the Kingdom of God* himself,
& went about to seek and save them that were lost; but also trained
up some of his Disciples to go about the same Office; and in this he was
their *Master* & their *Teacher*; & having fitted them for it, he gave them
Commission to go and *preach the Kingdom of Heaven* to others; but
still under his Care, Inspection and Authority; and in this he was
their *Bishop* or *Overseer*. So that in their former state they were a
Colledge of *Disciples* and he their *Master*; and in the Latter, a So-
ciety or Colledge of *Pastors*, and he their *Bishop* or *Overseer*. Af-
ter our Lords Ascension, the Apostles by Authority and Commission
from him, and being endued with Power from on High, go and *teach*
all Nations: and of those that were converted they train up some in
order to teach others, & so were their *Masters*, & they their *Disciples*, &
being so trained up they appointed them *Pastours* of others, they be-
ing still their *Overseers*, and the *Overseers* of those particular Churches
where they had settled them to be *Pastours*: and because it was not
possible for them to oversee all those Churches, and they were not
to abide for ever upon Earth; therefore they assume some of those
Pastours

Pastours into a share of this Presidency with themselves, to ordain Pastours or Elders in particular Churches, to see to the right order of all within those Churches, and to be their *Bishops* or *Overseers*.

Now that such an Order, Superiority and Subordination was observed in the Primitive Church, is evident from their writings: and because your Friend remarks that I had nam'd only *Ignatius*, I have, you see, made mention of more in this Paper, as you know many more might be added. And seeing he says 'it is such a base and disingenuous insinuation to pretend that such an imparity is evident from the *Epistles* of *Ignatius*, that he knows not what to think of it; give me leave to put you in remembrance of (what you know already) some passages of *Ignatius* his *Epistles*, that you, and the impartial Reader, may judge on what side the *base and disingenuous insinuation* lies, and what to think of it. The blessed Martyr *Ignatius*, in his *Epistle* to the Church of *Smyrna* sayes: *All of you follow the Bishop, as Jesus Christ the Father: and the Presbytery or Society of Presbyters as the Apostles: And withall honour the Deacons as the Institution of God.* In his *Epistle* to the *Ephesians* he says: *In the name of God I embraced you all in Onesimus, who is unspeakable in Charity, and your Bishop in the Flesh. It becomes you to concur in the sentence of the Bishop as you do. Your famous Presbytery (or Society of Presbyters) worthy of God, do so agree with the Bishop, as the strings with the Harp. Therefore is Jesus Christ celebrated and praised in your Concord and Harmonious Charity.* In his *Epistle* to the *Magnesiums*, I have been honoured to see you by *Damas* your Bishop, worthy of God, and by the worthy Presbyters *Bassus* and *Apollonius*, and by *Sotius* the Deacon, my fellow Servant, in whom I rejoyce, because he is subject to the Bishop, as the Grace of God, and to the Presbytery as the Law of Jesus Christ. ----- Because therefore I have beheld in the foresaid persons your whole multitude in faith and love, I warn you that you study to do all things in the Unity of God: the Bishop presiding in God's place, and the Presbyters in the place of the Council of the Apostles; and the Deacons, who are most dear to me, having the Ministration of Jesus Christ entrusted to them. ----- As therefore the Lord did nothing without the Father, being united, neither by himself, nor by the Apostles; so neither do you any thing without the Bishop and Presbyters. In his *Epistle* to the *Philadelphians*, I have said it with a loud Voice.

wit, h

with the Voice of God: Harken unto the Bishop, the Presbytery and the Deacons. Some suspected that I said this, as foreseeing the Division of some; but he in whom I am bound is witness, that I knew not this by human Flesh: but the Spirit proclaim'd it, saying thus, 'See that you do nothing without the Bishop. Keep your Body as the Temple of God. Love Unity. Flee Divisions. Be ye followers of Jesus Christ, as he was of his Father. In his Epistle to the Trallians: When you are subject to the Bishop as to Jesus Christ, you seem to me not to live as men, but as Jesus Christ. --- It is necessary therefore, as you do, to do nothing without the Bishop: and to be subject to the Presbytery, as to the Apostles of Jesus Christ our hope. It is fit also that the Deacons, being the Ministers of the mysteries of Jesus Christ, study in all things to please all men. For they are not the Ministers of Meat and Drink, but the Ministers of the Church of God. In like manner see that all of you Reverence the Deacons as the command of Jesus Christ; and the Bishop as Jesus Christ the Son of the Father; and the Presbyters as the Council of God and the Society of the Apostles. It becomes every one of you, especially the Presbyters to refresh the Bishop, in honour of the Father of Jesus Christ and of the Apostles. Farewell in Jesus Christ; and be subject to the Bishop as the Commandment of God; and also to the Presbytery.

It appears then that in Ignatius his time (who suffered Martyrdom in the tenth year of Trajan, twelve years after S. John had his Revelation manifested to him in the Isle of Patmos) there was a diversity of Church Officers, Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons; that he speaks of them all as of Divine Institution; that he requires respective Honour, Obedience and Submission to be given to them; to the Bishop as to Christ; to the Presbyters as the Apostles; to the Deacons as having the Ministration of Jesus Christ entrusted to them; that this Order and Government is like that of Christs own Institution, while he was upon Earth. Our Lord himself, the great Master and Bishop: next a Colledge of Disciples, first train'd up by him, and afterwards instituted Pastors under his Oversight and Care, and sent out by him to work in the Harvest: And then 70 Disciples more to minister in an Inferior degree. Even so was there in every Church the Bishop, the Colledge of Presbyters and the Deacons. I hope it will not be said that these Presbyters were Lay Elders

ders, and the Deacons, such as are in the Scots Presbyterian Constitution.

It does not follow that Ignatius his Bishop was no more than a Parish Minister, because he says in his Epistle to the *Philadelphians*: ἐν Θυσιασθείῳ, ὡς ἓς Ἐπίσκοπος: One Altar, and one Bishop. For he is such a Bishop as has a Colledge of Presbyters, and those Preaching Presbyters, and of Deacons. In that Epistle he is cautioning them against Schism. 'As many, *sayer he*, as are for God and for Jesus Christ, they are with the Bishop. Do not erre my brethren, if any be a follower of him who makes a Schism, he does not inherit the Kingdom of God. Study therefore to joyn in one Communion. For there is one Flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one Cup in the Union of his Blood; one Altar, and one Bishop, with the Presbytery and Deacons my fellow servants: that what you do, you may do it according to God.

As for what the Remarker says, that Ignatius in his Epistle to Polycarp sayes, *The Bishop ought to be acquainted with every Lad and Lasse, and the case of their Souls under his Inspection, and so could be no other than a Parish Minister*; it were good that every Parish Minister were now as careful of their respective Parishes, as then the Bishops were of whole Cities and their precincts. Ignatius his words are Ἐξ ὀνόματος πάντας ζητεῖ, δούλους καὶ δούλας μὴ ὑστερεῖν, *Enquire after all by name, and do not slight superciliously the servants and handmaids.* Thus the Seniors and Bishops in *Bohemia*, had Catalogues of all within the Parishes of their respective bounds, and took care to know them, and each Pastor was obliged to acquaint the Bishop twice a Month with his own State and that of his Parish.

As to his Remark of νεωτερικὴν τάξιν, (which has been so often cleared) as if thereby Ignatius meant, that the preference of a Bishop to Presbyters was a new Custom, it is a great mistake. He had said in his Epistle to the *Magnefians*: 'For I am honoured to see you by Damas your Bishop worthy of God, and by the worthy Presbyters Bassus and Apollonius, and the Deacon Sotion my fellow servant; in whom I rejoyce because he is subject to the Bishop, as to the Grace of God, and to the Presbytery as the Law of Jesus Christ. And then the next Paragraph begins thus: But it becomes you not to take advantage of the Bishops age, but according to the Power of God

'God the Father, to yield him all Réverence, as I know the Holy
'Presbyters do, and not to take advantage of his seemingly Young
'State, or Ordination, (*ἡ φαινομένη νεολεσχία τῆς ἡλικίας*) but as wise in the
'Lord, yielding to him, and not to him, but to the Father of Jesus,
'the Bishop of all, &c.

Sir, you say, "You readily yield, there has been a very antient
'use of some kind of Episcopacy in the Church; tho' far different
'from what it has been in after times. But that, as it hath not been
'so from the beginning, so it will not easily be proved, that our Mo-
'dern Prelacy was of universal use at all times, and in all places
'of the Church: Or that in any Age, far less that for 1500 years, it
'was believed and received uniuersally, that the Superiority of Bi-
'shops above Presbyters, was of Divine Institution, as a distinct Or-
'der and Office of the Church.

Sir, it was never well with the Church, since such a niceness of
School Terms was brought into it, and Men departed from the Sim-
plicity that is in Christ Jesus. There is a great Ambiguity in this
Paragraph of your Vindication (p. 23.) which had need to be
cleared: I want to know whether your meaning is, that it can not be
easily proved, that in any Age, far less for 1500 years, it was believed
and received universally, that the Superiority of Bishops above Pres-
byters was of Divine Institution, as a *Dignity* and *Office* in the Church;
Or that it was believed and received universally, to be of Divine In-
stitution as a distinct Order of the Church. If the last, this you know
is nothing to the Purpose: You know it was a very impertinent de-
bate among the School men (as they had many such) whether Epi-
scopacy was a *distinct Order* from Presbyterie, or one and the same
Order, and only a Superiour *Office* and *Dignity*; the *Canonists* main-
taining the first, and the *Divines* the last, and yet both sides owning
the Divine and Apostolical Institution of the Superiority of Episco-
pacy above Presbyterie in Office. Now to reason with Episcopacy
upon this head, is just as if the *Levites Numb. 3.* who were divided
into three great Families, would not have owned the Chiefs and
Overseers that were set over them, because it could not be made ap-
pear that they were a distinct order of Men, and therefore what were
they, that they should set themselves up above their Bretheren. It
is upon this quibble that your Friend, the *Remarker* (*Rem. 20*)
pretends

pretends to adduce the Testimony of so many learned Prelates against the Divine Right of Episcopacy, to *confront*, as he says, *the Author of the Case, and to look him out of Countenance*. Sir, I shall not say, that I can look him out of Countenance, but I am sure it would put a modest Man out of Countenance, to be convicted of the Gross Falsehoods which he is made appear to be guilty of, and one would think it might move the Commission of the General Assembly, not to expose themselves by employing such a Champion: and how impertinently he there cites the reverend Bishop *Usher*, as to the matter in debate in this Church, I think I need not tell you. But, to return to your Paragraph; if your meaning be, that it cannot be easily proved that in any Age it was believed and received universally, that the Superiority of Bishops above Presbyters, was of Divine Institution, as an Office in the Church, I think the Testimonies already adduced may be an evidence for it. And as to both senses, I shall give you Dr. *Forbes's* thoughts in his *Irenic. Lib. 2. cap. xi. prop. xii.* in the end of it: where, after having spoken of the debate between the *Divines* and *Canonists*, about the Number of Ecclesiastick Orders, and if Episcopacy is an Order distinct from Presbyterie; he concludes thus: "I thought fit to mention these things, that I might clearly shew that there is nothing in all this Controversie, that is contrary to our Propositions, of the Divine Right of the Episcopal Office and Dignity above simple Presbyters. For about this there was no debate among them: But all, with unanimous consent, both *Canonists*, and *Divines* do own Episcopacy to be a distinct Order from Presbyterie, if by Order you mean an Office of Divine Institution in the Church: And that by the Command of Christ, the Apostles did appoint in the primitive Church, Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons, and that these are three distinct Orders, with this Subordination, that the Deacons are under the Presbyters; and that by divine Right the Bishop presides over both Deacons and Presbyters. Now Sir, I think you will readily grant, that Dr. *Forbes* was as well vers'd in the Ecclesiastick writings, and of as great sincerity and Ingenuity in declaring their sentiments, as any Presbyterian of this or the last Age; & when you can prove him to be mistaken in this, I shall think you had reason for what you said. You grant *there has been a very antient use of some kind of Episcopacy in the Church*. You see it has been at least

as antient as *Ignatius* his time, twelve years after the writing of the *Revelation*; as ancient as the book of the *Revelation*, *Polycarp* being then Bishop of *Smyrna*, and *Ignatius* of *Antioch*; as antient as the *Epistles* to *Timothy* and *Titus*; tho it may be you will say, that this was an extraordinary Episcopacy and Superiority over Presbyters, that was not to be continued in the Church. I doubt it will not be so easily proved, that the present Presbyterian Government is founded upon the word of God and the practice of the Primitive Church; particularly, that the *Presidency of the Colledge of Presbyters or Ministers was ambulatory*, & that it is of Divine Right, & that there should be no constant and stated Moderator, and was the practice of the primitive Church; and that a part of the Colledge of Presbyters or Elders in every Church, were Lay Elders, such as had no right to Preach the Gospel or Administer the Sacraments; for according to the Presbyterian explications, all Pauls Presbyters were Bishops, and all Bishops had a right and Commission to preach the word: And your Remarks will grant, that according to *Ignatius*, there was but one Bishop in every Parish, the parish Minister. When in the foresaid paragraph you speake of Modern Prelacy, if you mean as to the essentials and the substance of it, whereby in a Colledge of Pastors, one Pastor hath the power of Ordination and Jurisdiction, in conjunction with the other Pastors, for the edification of the Church; without whom the other Pastors ought not to exerce these Offices; this I think, you will not deny to have been the universal practice of the Church for many Ages. Neither, as *Dr. Forbes* sayes as above cited, were mere Presbyters at any time the supream Rulers of a Church, unless perhaps, after the Apostles times, it might thro' an Oeconomical defect, happen sometime to some one particular Church. This Prelacy is that same Office for substance, which *Ignatius* had at *Antioch*, *Polycarp* at *Smyrna*, *Cornelius* in *Rome*, *Ireneus* at *Lyons*, *Cyprian* in *Carthage*, & many others had in other places before the *Nicen Council*, & which *Chrysostom*, *Augustin* & many others had after it. And as to the Accidentals of such a Prelacy, and the Corruptions that may have crept into it, we are not to justify them; we see no Church Government, but what has its Corruptions, and has need to be bettered and amended, and reduc'd more to the primitive Institution: And the Church Government that's without fault, let it cast the first Stone at the other. Where there is a plain ingenuity and real sense and
ack-

acknowledgement of ones faults, whether party or person, there is always hopes of amendment, but where this is wanting we can scarce look for the other. The Church of Rome pretends to Infallibility by Principle, & the Scots Presbyterian Kirk by Practice, & how eisher of these shall be prevailed with to redress what is amiss, & to unite in Primitive Christianity, is hard to determine. Did Men of Knowledge, Prudence, Piety and Moderation, such as I hope you are, frankly speak the truth without respect to any party, so as not to be overaw'd by the Bigotry of a party, this might come to put to silence the Ignorance of foolish men, and make them ashamed to dote about *questions and Strifes of words, whereof cometh Envy, Strife, Railings, evil Surmisings, perverse disputings &c.* and would lead them to consent to *wholsom words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Doctrin which is according to Godliness*: but when the former sort are rather overaw'd by the latter, and led to go along with them in all their dividing measures, there are small hopes of seeing a berter state of things.

In the 8th. Page of the *Case &c.* is shown ' how the greatest part ' of the Western Churches, that found it necessary to separat from the ' Church of Rome, were careful to do it only in those things, which ' they saw were manifest Corruptions, in Doctrine and worship, and ' not to abandon what was in it self good, and of Primitive and Apostolick Original, however it might have been abused by that Church, ' but to retrieve the good and Antient use thereof: and of this many Instances are given: all which the *Remarker* passes over, because those of his party have followed the quite contrary method. The last Instance given is, their Care not to throw away *the Apostolick order of Degrees, Imparity and Subordination in the Ministers and Pastors of the Church*, and the just reasons they had for this Care; and the chief thing intended in the Paragraph, was to give a hint of the principal reasons why so many of the reformed Churches thought fit to continue such an Imparity, which an impartial Reader will think deserve Consideration. These the *Remarker* passes over, and insists only in denying that any Reformed Church judged Episcopacy to be of Divine Right, or necessary for the peace and order of the Church, and to avoid Schism and Confusion, either at the Reformation, or to this day; and for an evidence of this, cites *Le Blanc* his *Theses de Grad.*

& distinct. Minist. and *Stillington's* account, in his *Irenicum*, of Arch-Bishop *Cranmer's* Judgement in that matter. The last you know is sufficiently cleared by *Ducl*, in his account of the Conformity of Foreign Churches with that of *England*: and the Author of the *Imparity of Pastors &c.* sets down his Vindication of *Cranmer*. *M. Le Blanc* in the place cited by the *Remarker*, grants it is the general & common opinion of the *English*, that the superiority of Bishops above Presbyters is of divine Right: And what the *Remarker* affirms, that this conceit (as he is pleased to call it) is but advanced of late, is not true. It is as old as their Reformation (as well as it was the constant Doctrine of that and other Churches before the Reformation) the Church of *England* own'd the divine Right of Episcopacy from the beginning of the Reformation. In the Preface prefixed to the form of Ordination (one of the chief composers of which was Arch-Bishop *Cranmer*, in the Reign of King *Edward* the VI.) it is expressly said: *It is certain not only from the writings of the antient Fathers, but also from the Sacred Scriptures themselves, that these Orders of Ministers viz. Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons, have been in the Church from the very times of the Apostles.* This Form of Ordination, and the Preface prefixed to it, were written and published by *Cranmer* and his Bretheren in the 1st year of King *Edward* the VI. And in all times since the Reformation, the most learned of the Church of *England*, have asserted the Divine Right of Episcopacy. The *Reformed of Bohemia*, you see, were so convinced of the Divine Institution of this Imparity, that in order to have a continued Succession of Bishops and Presbyters lawfully ordained, they sent three of their Pastors, to the Bishop of the *Waldenses*, to be consecrated Bishops, and cloathed with the power of Ordaining others. And that many other Reformed Churches found it necessary for the peace and order of the Church, to have such an Imparity of Pastours, appears from their Practice. In all the Churches that follow the *Ausburgh* Confession, there is a Subordination of Pastors. Those of them in *Germany*, have *Superintendents*. In *Denmark*, *Sweden* and *Norway*, they have *Bishops*, both Name and Thing. In the Protestant Cantons of *Switzerland*, there is a Subordination among their Ministers, viz. *Superintendents*, *Pastors* and *Deacons*. So in all other forraign Reformed Churches, (*France*, *Geneva* and *Holland* excepted) in the *Palatinate*, in *Hessen*, in the *Elect*or of *Brande-*

Brandebourghs Dominions, as well among them whom they call *Calvinists*, as among the *Lutherans*, in the Princedome of *Anhalt*, in the City of *Bremen*, in *Poland*, and *Lithuania &c.* No Ministers in any of these Churches, ought to be ordained, according to their Discipline, without the Inspector or Superintendent, and in some the Superintendent alone gives the Imposition of Hands. These Superintendents have that which is essential to the function of a Bishop, viz. *The power of Ordination and Jurisdiction.* Nothing is done without them, and great respect is had to them. So the *Hungarian*, *Transylvanian*, and *Bohemian* Reformed Churches had Bishops both Name and Thing.

And that many in the *French Protestant* Church, even in the time of *Le Blanc*, spoke with great respect and esteem of the Episcopal Order, appears from the many Testimonies of *French* Ministers, adduced by *Durel*, in his view of the Government and Publick Worship of the forraign Reformed Churches. Thus *Mr. De Moyne* Minister at *Roan* in a Letter to *Dr. Brevint* says: "Truly I believe not that it is possible to keep either peace or order in your Church, without preserving the Episcopal Dignity, and I confess that I conceive not by what Spirit they are led, that oppose that Government and cry it down with such violence. For I desire any Man whosoever he be, to shew me if he can, another Order more futeable with reason, yea or better agreeing with the Holy Scriptures, and of which God hath made more use for the Establishment of his Truth, and the amplification of his Kingdom &c. *Mr. de L'Angle* in a Letter to *Dr. Brevint* says: "I cannot tell what the haters of the peace of the Church mean, that prattle up and down, and talk as if the *French* Churches were great adversaries to the Episcopal Order; and as if we held it quite contrary unto Christs Kingdom, and affirmed it to be a foul Relick of *Amichristianism.* God forbid, Sir, that we should have such a perverse and rash opinion. I am sure that neither *Monsieur Daille*, nor *Monsieur Amyraut*, nor *Monsieur Bochart*, nor any of my Colleagues of *Roan* ever approved it: I that am the least of my Bretheren am as far from it as any. --- An Episcopacy well tempered, and well poised; an Episcopacy framed after the model which was exercised, with so much success, by those Prelates of the Apostolick Churches, which Christ calls *Angels*; such as *Clemens*, *Polycarpus*, *Irenous*,
Cyprian

Cyprian, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Austin, and many others of the like kind, who have been in the Church the Sweet Savour of Christ: 'It is a most Sacred and most antient Order; and if the Apostles themselves were not the Authors of it, certainly it was instituted by Apostolick Men, who might say of their Ordinances of this Nature, the same that the Apostle said sometimes after he had gravely resolved some questions, about which he had no express command from God: *I think also that I have the Spirit of God.* And Monsieur *Dreincourt*, one of the Ministers of *Charenton*, in a Letter to Dr. *Brevint* sayes: "as *Germany* and *Switzerland* have their Inspectors and Superintendants, and *Denmark* and *Sweden* their Bishops, I see no reason why any one should be offended that *England* hath likewise her Bishops. If there be no Bishops in the Reformed Churches of *France*, it is because our condition cannot bear it. But if God should graciously incline our Monarch, and all his subjects, or most of them, to embrace the Reformed Religion; it would be to my Judgement altogether impossible to maintain an equality amongst such a Multitude of Ministers, and it would be necessary to set up some above the others: and to give them the preheminance, that they might be the Overseers of their carriage, subjecting all to Provincial and National Synods. And Monsieur *Gaches* one of the ministers of *Charenton*, in one of his Letters to Dr. *Br.* sayes: "Would to God we had no other differences with the Bishops of *France*, but about their Dignity: how chearfully should I submit my self to them ---- How comes it to pass then that those of your presbyterians, that are great, understanding and wise men, have such any aversion against moderate Episcopacy? & why do they refuse to have communion with *Ignatius, Polycarp, Cyprian* and *Chrysostom*, and all that holy company of the purest Antiquity? I am of that opinion, that if all Ministers could be wise at all times, and keep themselves in good order, they would have no need of Overseers; as there would have been no need of Kings and Judges, if men had kept their Primitive Innocency; but Sin hath brought in the necessity of Government, and the failings of Ministers make the Order of Bishops necessary. The famous *Monsieur de Bose*, Minister of the Reformed Church of *Caen*, in a letter to the foresaid person, sayes of Episcopacy: "We acknowledge that this Order hath signal advantages, and I think not that any of my Brethren will contradict me, if I say that a well ordered

'dered Episcopacy hath most important and considerable utilities which
 'cannot be found in the Presbyterian Discipline. If we have followed
 'the last in our Churches, it is not for any aversion we have against
 'the former: It is not because we hold Episcopacy to be contrary to
 'the Nature of the Gospel, or because we think it less convenient for
 'the Good of the Church, or less worthy of the Condition of the
 'true Flocks of the Lord, but it is because necessity hath obliged us
 'to it; because the Reformation having been begun in this Kingdom
 'by the People, and by Inferiour Church men, the places of Bi-
 'shops remained filled with men of a contrary Religion; so that we
 'were constrained to content our selves with Ministers and Elders as
 'well as we could, for fear of setting Bishop against Bishop in the
 'same Town, which would have caused furious troubles and impla-
 'cable wars, and put a great stop to the Progress of the Gospel. If
 'Bishops had embrac'd the Reformation at first, I make no doubt but
 'their Order had been maintained in the Ecclesiastical Polity. And I
 'find a convincing proof of that, in an Epistle of *Peter Martyr*, the 57.
 'to *Theod. Beza*, of the Bishop of *Troyes* in *Champagne*; who having
 'acknowledged the Truth, began to Preach it publickly, and being de-
 'fireous to know of the Reformed whether they would acknowledge
 'him for their Bishop, they after mature deliberation, declare unani-
 'mously, that they received him for their true and lawful Bishop.
 'Can any doubt but that if the other Bishops of the Kingdom had fol-
 'lowed his Example, they had continued in their Station? ... Where-
 'fore the practice of the Church of *France* ought to be no precedent
 'for the Church of *England*. And if there be any in *England* so rigidly
 'partial for Presbyterian Parity: as to juggle against that antient Order
 'of Episcopacy; and seek to root it quite out, to the prejudice both
 'of Church and State, they cannot but be very much blam'd for it.
 All this, *Sir*, is well known to you, so that some *posthumous Theses*
 of the Learned *Le Blanc*, are no sufficient evidence of the Opinion of
 the Reformed Church in *France*, concerning Episcopacy.

And as for the Presbyterians in *England*, you know how willingly up-
 on the Restauration of King *Charles the II.* they would have embrac'd
 Episcopacy according to the Model of Bishop *Usher's* reduction,
 and that because they judg'd it most agreeable to the Primitive and
 Apostolick pattern. You grant, *Sir*, there has been a very antient use

of some kind of Episcopacy in the Church, and therefore give me leave to mind you of the Pious Mr. *Richard Baxter* his Judgement upon that head, both because it was the sentiment of the moderate Presbyterians in *England*, at that time, such as Mr. *Corbet* and others, and for that his reasoning about it is so forcible and convincing with unbiass'd Persons, & is the same which *Chillingworth* and others have used to so good purpose. It is in his *Disp. de Regimine ecclesie disp. 3. c. 4. sect. 16, 17.* "The Antiquity and Universality of this Government (by 'Stated and constant Presidents (*Προεστώται*) who had a Negative 'Vote, as they call it, so that without their consent, nothing of any Mo- 'ment was done by the rest of the Ministers) which was so early in 'the Church, is, *saith he*, a strong Argument to keep us within the 'bounds of Moderation upon this point. For first, it seems a most im- 'probable thing, that all or so many Churches should so suddenly set 'up such a Presidency, Prelacy or Imparity without any Scruple or 'Reluctance, if this had been contrary to the mind of the Apostles. 'For no Body can Fancy to himself, that all the Churches founded by 'the Apostles or Apostolick Men, who had seen them and conversed 'with them, could either be altogether ignorant of the mind of the 'Apostles, in a matter of this nature, which was a thing of general 'practice; or that all of them would so slight the Doctrine freshly 'delivered to them by their Teachers, as presently and with one ac- 'cord to consent to a change, or at least not to oppose it? Would 'not one Church, not one of the Faithful have contended for keeping 'to the Institutions of the Apostles? Would not some one Church 'have retained their Rights, and the Order already settled among 'them, and protested against the corruption and innovations of the 'rest? would none of the Faithful have said, *Now you are going about 'to change the Form of Church Government, which the Holy Spirit 'hath lately Instituted among us. It was not so while Peter, or Paul, 'or John lived. Therefore we will admitt of no change.* To me it 'seems an incredible thing, that the Universal Church should almost 'at one and the same time submit so suddenly to such a change of 'Government, & not make the least remonstrance against it. For I do not 'think that there can be produced any Testimony out of all the Volumes 'of the Antients, by which it can be made appear, that there was so 'much as one Church or one Christian, who opposed that Change or did

Remon-

‘Remonstrate against it, at the time that it must have been done, if ever
 ‘it was done, that is in the first and second Age; yea it is plain, as
 ‘*Jerom* and other of the Antients testifie, that at least in the Church
 ‘of *Alexandria* this form of Government was settled in the very times
 ‘of the Apostles. All of them testifie, that in *Alexandria* from *Mark*
 ‘the Evangelist, unto *Heraclius* and *Dionysius Bishops*, the Presbyters
 ‘chose out always one from among themselves, and placed him in a higher
 ‘degree above the Presbyters, whom they named the Bishop, even as an
 ‘Army should choose a General. Now it is manifest from the best
 ‘Chronologers, that *Mark* was killed about the year of our Lord 63,
 ‘the 10th of *Nero*. *Peter* and *Paul* were put to death about the year
 ‘of God 66 the 13th of *Nero’s* Reign. *John* died about the year of
 ‘our Lord 98, in the 1st of *Trajan’s* Reign, about 35 years after the
 ‘death of *S. Mark*. Now I leave it to any, that is not bigotted to a
 ‘partie, to judge whether it be credible, that the Holy Apostles and all
 ‘the Evangelists or their Assistants, who were then alive, would have
 ‘suffered this Corruption and Innovation to have been brought in with-
 ‘out Reproof or Correction. Would they have sitt still in silence,
 ‘and seen a Government newly Instituted by them, so violated while
 ‘they were yet alive, & never so much as warned the Churches of their
 ‘Sin and Danger, or if they really admonished them, would not so
 ‘much as one Church have regard to their warnings? Would not one
 ‘of them be so far mindful of them, as at least to oppose the Sin of it?
 ‘All this is incredible. So far *Mr. Baxter*. This, *Sir*, you know is the
 demonstration of the Apostolical Institution of Episcopacy urged by
Mr. Chillingworth, and lately reprinted here, with Arch-bishop *Usher*
 his Original of Bishops, to which *Mr. Baxter* and the moderate Pres-
 byterians in *England* did assent. Now *Sir*, I leave it to your Self, and
 to the Impartial Reader, to make the Reflections that naturally arise
 from this Subject.

But the matter that is chiefly in debate between those of the Epi-
 scopal and Presbyterian perswasion in *Scotland*, as to Episcopacy, is not
 chiefly concerning the Divine Right but the Lawfullness of it. The
 Cant of your party, in their Writings and Sermons, is, that Prelacy (the
 Superiority of any Church Officer above Presbyters) is unlawful, and
 contrary to the word of God, and Antichristian: and that Presbyterie is
 the only Government appointed by Christ in his Church. Care is tak-
 en

en to have the People leavened with this Doctrine; and much stress is
 laid upon it; and they are made believe, that *Preslacy* is contrary to all
 true Religion and Godliness; and that they are bound by *Solemn Cove-*
nant to extirpate it; & that all who own it in this Nation are perjur'd.
 Sir, I shall not say, that this is your Judgement, because you chear-
 fully preach'd the Gospel, and performed the other parts of your Mi-
 nistry for many years, under the Inspection of the Venerable *Patrick*
Scougal Bishop of *Aberdeen*, who was so great an Ornament to his
 Character, and you cordially concurr'd with him in the Ordination of
 Pastors, and the Exercise of Ecclesiastick Jurisdiction in Presbyteries
 and Synods, and you and your fellow Presbyters of the Episcopal
 Perswasion, went all on chearfully in the same Yoke: Tho' I confess
 it is somewhat stumbling to see you, it seems, troubled for this, and
 for being told that you promised under your hand, *Obedience to the*
then Government of the Church in all things Lawful, and to concur in
Ecclesiastical meetings, and to be accomptable to the Ordinary the Bishop
of Aberdeen, then being, and his Successors, for your Preaching and Ad-
ministrations, and to contribute your endeavours for the Order and
Peace of the Church. This Engagement was so just, that I wonder to
 see you tell the World, that you trusted to another the drawing up of
 that Paper and that you are sorry for it and repent of it; for this
 would look like your being of the same mind with your present Bre-
 theren in this matter. If otherwise, I am sure you had far greater rea-
 son freely to own & justify it, as another worthy Person had the Chri-
 stian courage to do, as I may have occasion to shew in the same Para-
 graph. But that this is the common and prevailing Doctrine of the
 Presbyterians in this Nation, their Writings and Sermons do testifie.
 Now as this was never the Doctrine of any before the Reformation
 besides *Acrius*, for which, as it appears from *Augustine* & *Epiphanius*,
 he was condemn'd of *Heresie*, so never any of the Reformers, or
 any Forraign Protestant, did ever judge Episcopal Government to be
 unlawful. Even all those of them who judged the Institution of it
 to be only Ecclesiastical and not Apostolical and Divine, yet they
 own'd it, to be a Pious and Christian Institution, nor contrary to the
 Word of God, but consonant to it, and useful for the Church, and
 tending to Edification, and that it could not be condemn'd without
Heresie, as is to be seen in the 12 chap. of the 2d. Book of Dr. *Forbes*
 his

his *Irenicum*. This then is the true Cause and Occasion of all the Evils, Schism, and Confusions in this Church. And this I chuse to lay before you in the words of a Venerable Person, Mr. *Laurence Charter*, sometime Professor of Divinity in *Edinburgh* (a very few of whose excellent discourses are lately published here, under the title of *The Difference between True and False Christianity*) and that in a short discourse of his, upon occasion of the first general Fast, appointed in this Nation, after the late settlement of Presbytery Anno 1690, which was designed, you know, to be a trying Fast; in which all both Ministers and People were to humble themselves, and profess their Repentance for their great defection from Presbyterie, and their Compliance with Prelacy. And he, being then Minister at *Dirletoun*, found it his Duty to declare his mind plainly on that Subject to the People, which he hath left upon Record written with his own hand, as follows.

Before, saith he, the Paper was read I used these words.

"Here is a Paper concerning a Fast, to be kept throughout this Kingdom on *Thursday* next, which is now, in Obedience to the Command of the Lords of his Majesties Most Honourable Privy Council, to be read in your hearing.

After the Reading of the Paper, I said as Follows

"Ye have heard the causes of the Fast, as they are represented by the General Assembly; They have recommended it to Pastors and others, to be Serious and Sincere, in the Confession and Acknowledgement of their own Sins, and the Nations Transgressions, and to be earnest in their Supplications for such Favours from God, as the present Condition and Circumstances, in which we and other Reformed Churches are, do call for. I hope after the hearing of so long a Paper, you will have a little farther Patience, while I sincerely represent to you some things concerning the Sins which we are to confess, and the Mercies for which we are to Supplicate.

"All who are Wise, and have a right Sense of true Religion and Christianity, cannot but see there has been a great defection among us. The Defection has not been from the Truth, or from the Fundamental Articles of the Christian Faith, but from the Life of God, and the Power

'Power of Religion, and from that Temper and Conversation which
 'the Gospel requires in us. So that I doubt not but that we, and all
 'good Men, will joyn with the Assembly, in acknowledging the Sins &
 'defection of the Nation. But whereas the Assembly seems to repre-
 'sent Episcopacy as a Principal and Capital point of the Defection;
 'I find my self obliged to declare my sense in this affair, on this oc-
 'casion. I do not take my self to be bound to endeavour to justify
 'the manner of Election and Nomination of Persons to that Office,
 'which was in use among us; nor the Legal Establishment, or the Laws
 'by which it was Established among us; nor the conduct of those
 'who were in Office: and I will not say, but that some who were in
 'the Office of Episcopacy, and that complied with that Government,
 'might have been in some measure accessory to the Corruption, by
 'their bad Example, or connivence, and neglect of the true Exercise of
 'Discipline. But yet I cannot think that the settling of an *Imparity*,
 'among the Officers of the Church, is to be looked upon as a defection,
 'or that it is a thing in it self unlawful, or that it is of it self intro-
 'ductory of the abounding of Wickedness and Scandals in the Church.
 'This I may with the greatest confidence affirm, that Religion never
 'Flourished more in the World, than it did, when and where there
 'was an Imparity among the Officers of the Church: And this I know,
 'that some Famous Protestant Churches, do allow *Episcopacy*, and con-
 'tinue to this Day under that Form of Government. And I am sure
 'that most of the Wise, Pious and Learned Men abroad, tho' they
 'live where the Government is not Episcopal, have not such bad
 'thoughts of it, as our Bretheren here have. And whereas they charge
 'many of the then standing Ministry with Compliance with the Al-
 'teration of the Government, I do not see that the Continuance of
 'Pastors to serve God and the Church under the late Settlement, is to
 'be look'd upon as a Defection for which they are to Repent: diverse
 'of them having continued to serve in the Ministry, neither out of
 'Pride, or Covetousness, or Fear, or Weakness and want of Courage,
 '[*these were the reasons set down by the Assembly in the Paper.*]
 'But out of Conscience and a Fear to offend God, by refusing their
 'Service in that Station, when there was no insuperable stop or bar
 'put in their way, as they thought then there was not; and the like
 'may be said of many others, who entered afterwards into the Pasto-
 'ral Office under the late Government.

But

'But, notwithstanding of that which we have said hereanent, we cannot but acknowledge that there has been a great defection among us. Men generally have shaken off the Yoke of Christ, and have expressed none of that respect which we all ow to his Laws, and have abandoned themselves to their Lusts and corrupt Inclinations, so that Iniquities and Immoralities of all sorts have abounded; and generally, men of all ranks have corrupted their wayes. Covetousness, Fraud, Oppression, Injustice, Sensuality, Drunkenness, and diverse kinds of Uncleanness, Cursing and Swearing, Atheism, neglect of the Worship of God, and other Sins besides these reckoned in this Paper, have abounded.

'The Assembly acknowledges that there have been some disorders among those of their Perswasion, which they say is matter of Humiliation, such as *Scandalous Divisions, Injurious Reflections against worthy Men, and some Dangerous Principles drunk in*. They say it should be lamented that some of their way, who in the main things did endeavour to maintain their Integrity, did not give seasonable and necessary Testimony against the Defections and Evils of the Times, and did not keep a due distance from them. If they do mean hereby, and I know not what else can be understood by it, that it is to be lamented that some of their way did not separate from such as complied with the Government, but did joyn in Worship with them; this will not appear to any other, besides some of themselves, to be matter of Lamentation: it is rather matter of Lamentation that so many of them did behave *Schismatically*, and refused to joyn in Worship, on such slender Grounds, with those who were not of the same perswasion with them concerning the Government.

"They seem to appropriate to those of their way that they *endeavoured to keep their Integrity in the main things*, and that *they did own Truth, and bear witness against the course of Defection*; but I know not a few, among those who complied, that did endeavour to maintain their Integrity in the main things, and did own all the necessary and fundamental Truths of the Gospel, and did bear faithfull Witness against the Course of the true and real Defection from Truth and Righteousness. They confess, as I understand it, that all of whatsoever perswasion, generally do not receive Christ, nor imitate him &c.

'They

"They have past over *many Sins* of those of *their way*, which all o-
 'ther People see, whereof some are almost proper to them. How ma-
 'ny of them are *Proud, Fierce, Covetous, Turbulent, Seditious* and
 'Ungovernable? Many of them presume to *Judge, Censure, Reproach,*
 'Revile and *Traduce* such as are not of their way, tho' Magistrates
 'and Ministers. Not a few seem to place all Religion in a *zeal for*
 'their proper opinions, and in running separate Courses from those
 'who are not of their Perswasion. Many of them are of a *Fallious,*
 'Schismatical and *Uncharitable Temper*, and have by their *Bitter* and
 'Indiscreet *zeal*, been prompted to such *Inhumane, Barbarous & Cruel*
 'Actions, which have been so much the more Scandalous, as being Act-
 'ed under the Colour and Pretence of Religion. These and such like
 'should be confessed Ingenuously, and Mourned for. And, O! that it
 'might please God to make us all sensible, how far we have declined
 'from that Spirit and Temper, and the Behaviour and Conversation
 'which the Gospel requires of us, and to dispose us to Reform and
 'Amend.

'As to those things for which we are desired to Pray, we have all
 'reason heartily to joyn with them. There is only one expression which
 'I have observed, in which I fear they mean somewhat, for which I
 'cannot join in Prayer with them. The expression is, that *that all the Lords*
 '*People may be of one mind in the Lord.* If they mean by it, as they should
 'do, that they all agree in the *Fundamentals* of Religion, and may *with one*
 '*mind and one mouth Glorifie God*, and may *live in Love and Peace,*
 'and jointly pursue the attainment of Everlasting Life, it is a very fit
 'Petition, and we are all earnestly to pray for it. But if they mean,
 'that we are to Pray, that all may have the like *Sentiments* with them-
 'selves about the *Government* of the Church, and may consider *Pres-*
 '*byterian Government* to be of such concern and importance as they
 'themselves take it to be, I cannot joyn with them in it. That *Opinion*
 'being the *Source* of most of the Distractions which abound among us,
 'and depriving them who hold it, of that *Charity*, they ow to all who
 'hold the *Fundamentals* of the Christian Faith, & walk agreeably to
 'the *Laws* of the Gospel. It incapacitates them, who hold it, for per-
 'forming all *Offices* of Love to those who are not of their Perswasion;
 'and prompts them to behave towards all such, as enemies to God and
 'Religion. It makes them look, with an *Evil Eye*, on those Protestant
 Churches

'Churches which have not such a mode of Government, and begets in them a *neglect*, dislike and aversion from these Churches.

'I use not to speak so much of these things in such an Auditory, nor had I now spoken of them, if we had been so discreetly dealt with, as not to be driven to it.

On the Thursday, being the Day appointed for the Fast, I said:

'This Day is set apart for Fasting & Humbling our selves under the sense of our own Sins, and the Sins of the Church and Nation of which we are Members, and to deprecate the Wrath and Heavy Judgements which our Sins deserve; and to beg Mercy from God &c. And indeed it is evident that we are all highly Guilty before God, and have grievously provoked him to Wrath and Indignation against us. We have disobeyed and despised the Gospel, and almost Universally, under the Profession of the Christian Religion, have Lived as *Heathens*: and whereas, the Gospel teaches us to live Righteously, Godly and Soberly, Ungodliness, Unrighteousness, Uncharitableness and Intemperance have abounded among us. It is fit that we confess these things with Grief and Sorrow. The Assembly, in that Paper which was read to you the other day, tho' they lay open the Sins of others, yet are they too sparing in confessing those of their own way: They say, among other things, that when Episcopacy was introduced, many Faithful Ministers were cast out, and many Insufficient and Scandalous Men were thrust in, on their Charges; but there is not a word in all the Paper of not a few Faithful Pastors cast out, by some of their way, in a Disorderly and Tumultuous manner, they being private Persons without Authority. I wish the Vacancies they have made, may not be supplied by Scandalous Persons, or such as are Weak and insufficient and destitute of a right sense and understanding of Religion.

Sir, you know very well that the Reverend Mr. *Charters* was a Person of great understanding and learning, and of no less Probity, Humility and Piety; that he was slow to speak, and thought well what he spoke; and nothing but the deep sense he had of this Evil, would have forced him to say so much on this Subject.

Among the many reasons given, in the 9th. and 10th. pages of the *Case*, why the greatest part of the Reformed Churches saw it fit not to

throw away the Antient and Apostolick Order of Imparity and Subordination among the Pastors of the Church; the *Remarker* nibbles only at a part of one of them, their observing that *where there is Parity, there is also Prelacy upon the matter, or a continual Strife and Confusion.* He asks if this be design'd to throw a Reproach upon all Judicatories where matters are manag'd by Judges acting in Parity &c. The matter in Debate is concerning Church Officers; and the very reason given by *Jerom*, why Episcopacy was established in the Apostolick times, was, because of the Strife and divisions that arose from this Parity; And we have not reason to think that the Passions and Corruptions of men are more mortified now. And the instances, the *Remarker* brings of other Judicatories, are not parallel: They have not ambulatory but stated Presidents, and both the Antient & modern Common-Wealths, are Models very different from the *Scots* Presbyterian Government. The Argument in the *Case*, does not infer, as the *Remarker* pretends, *Rem. 7.* That every Cause should be judg'd by one Monarchical kind of a man &c. The Presbyterian Ministers are still taken up about the exercising of Christ's Kingly Power, and do all look upon themselves as his Leivtenant-Deputies, and are much taken up about the making of new Acts and Ordinances, and exacting Obedience to them, and censuring and judging those that do not in all things come up to them, and getting the Civil power to enforce their Ordinances; and they are never more elevated than when they are on the head of Armies, and Advancing the Kingdom of Christ by Pike and Musquet, into other Nations, as in the Glorious and happy Days of the Solemn League and Covenant; When the General Assemblies and Commissions were mighty Courts indeed, and determined the Fate of Kings and Monarchs, and made the Greatest humble themselves before them. For my part, I look upon all these measures as Anti-Christian indeed, and am perswaded that the Spirit of Anti-Christ has not confin'd himself within the Church of Rome. *My Kingdom is not of this world, saith our Lord, else would my Children fight. The Kingdom of God is within you.* Jesus Christ came to teach men by word and deed how to yield up their Wills to God and to deny themselves. He train'd up a Colledge of Pastours to Preach this Gospel of the Kingdom to others. and that each of them also might be Head, Guide and Watchman of such another Colledge and Society of Pastors, as he had been

been to them, and so onwards thro' all succeeding Ages and places. While all continued in the Spirit of Christ Jesus, there was no place for debates of this Nature. The Presbyters Reverenc'd their Overseer and did nothing without his Counsel and Direction, and the Overseer went before them, chiefly in Self-denial, and in reckoning himself as the least of them, and a Servant of them all. And while they thus *did the will of God, they knew of the Doctrine whether it was of God, while they kept the Mystery of Faith in a Pure Conscience*, but when they put away the last, *concerning the Faith they made Ship-wrack*. Now, it is possible that one Good Man may be found sooner than a Hundred or a Thousand. Or if a Bishop be in such an Errour as corrupts the Faith, or abett others that do so, he may be corrected by the Colledge of Bishops, or by a National Assembly, or by the Synod of Presbyters. If on the other hand the most part of the Ministers of a Presbyterie, or of a Synod, or of a General Assembly are not good men, they can never be truly Orthodox; if they are such as the Apostle foretells shall be in the last days, *when perituous times shall come, that Men shall be Lovers of their own Seloes, Covetous, Boasters Proud, &c. Having a form of Godliness, but denying the Power of thereof*, they may well be zealous for their Forms and Confessions, but they can never stand for the truth, as it is in Christ Jesus; being *men of corrupt minds, they resist the truth, & are reprobate concerning the Faith*. Now, if the greatest part of a hundred Ministers, or a Thousand, are a sett of men of this spirit, they are the unfittest persons in the world to chastise the essential disorders of Prelacy. If the Remarker demonstrates that this cannot be, or is far less probable than the other, then he says something for the preference of Parity, for inferiours rising up against their superiours, for Sons chastising their Parents, else all his reasoning is meer Sophism. The Question is not about the form of Government, of this or that Church, for perhaps they had all need to be bettered and amended. But in general, *if the Superiority of any Church Officers above Presbyters be contrary to the word of God, the Institution of Jesus Christ, and the Nature and Ends of Church Government*. That such an Imparity is of excellent use to preserve both from Schism and Errour, is demonstrated by matter of Fact in the *Reformed of Bohemia* for 200 years, till they were wholly oppress'd and rooted out by the House of *Austria*; and there was never such a proof

of the usefulness of Presbyterian Parity as to either. As to the Constitution of a National Synod, perhaps it needed to be helped. But then it is to be remembered, that the Calling of the *Westminster Assembly* depended entirely, upon the *English* Parliament, by it all the Members were particularly nominated, nothing could be proposed or debated there, without the Parliament's allowance; the Parliament did nominate the *Prases*, so that if the prevailing part of the Parliament was for Independent Church Government, favour'd Antinomianism, and entertain'd many other errors contrary to the Spirit, Life and Doctrin of Christ Jesus, there were no hopes that that Assembly would correct them. And yet its *Confession of Faith*, must be to us the Standart of Christianity.

A Parity in the highest Judicatories (or in general Councils) does not infer, as the *Remarker* would have it, that it may and ought to be so in the inferiour Judicatories also, else the *Remarker* must grant there may and ought to be a Parity in *Kirk Sessions*, and the *Lay Elders* ought by Course to be Chosen Moderators of the *Kirk Session*, as Mr. *George Buchanan* was of the General Assembly. If it be said the Minister is an Elder a degree above the Lay Elder, and therefore ought to be constant Moderator of *Kirk Sessions*, so I say the Bishop is an Elder a degree above the Minister, and therefore ought to be constant Moderator of the Synod of Ministers, over whom he is Overseer.

Your Friend the *Remarker*, his inferring P. 10. That the Author of the Case seems but too much disposed for a Pope over the whole Church and that one of the Reasons mentioned, in the 9th P. of the Case, why the Reformed Churches kept up an Imparity of Church Officers, (viz. that as every particular flock of Christian People needed a Pastor and a Watchman, so did every Flock of Pastors need a Watch-man to superintend them) Proves the necessity of a Pope, or nothing at all, shews only the temper of his Spirit: And the Author of the *Imparity among Pastors* has brought in Calvin to baffle him to excellent purpose, which because it discovers how far he was from being a Scots Presbyterian, I shall here Repeat. In a Letter to the King of Poland he saith: 'Neither is it possible or convenient that there should be one head of all the Churches upon Earth, for that would far exceed the Capacity of human weakness;

neither could it be adapted to common use. Indeed the Antient Church appointed Patriarches; and withall constituted Primates over the Respective Provinces; that by this Bond of Concord the Bishops might abide in the firmer Union among themselves. Even as it now a days there were one Arch-Bishop set over the most illustrious Kingdom of Poland; not to Lord it over the rest, or to deprive them of the Right that belongs to them, and to arrogate it to himself; But that for Orders sake, he might preside in the Synod, and maintain a Holy Unity amongst Colleagues and Brethren. Next, there might be Provincial or City Bishops, who should take particular care of preserving Order; for Nature teaches this, that one should be chosen in every Colledge upon whom the chief care may lie. For it is quite another thing to have a Charge and honour so moderated as is consistent with humane power, than by a boundless Empire to grasp at the whole Earth. Thus Calvin thought not that such a superiority above ordinary Pastors was Anti-Christian, or that it prov'd the necessity of a Pope,

The foresaid Author of *Imparity among Pastors &c.* (as many others before have done) has evidently made appear, that such an *Imparity* was at first established at the Reformation in Scotland; that the *Superintendents* had power to visit all the Churches within their Diocess, to place Ministers, to Ordain them, to try their Life, diligence and behaviour, to examin and Censure their Doctrine, to Transplant them, to call their Synods, constantly to preside in them, to receive Appeals from particular Ministers and Kirk Sessions and to determine in them. The Ministers were bound to be Subject to them in all Lawful Admonitions, not to admit persons guilty of Repeated Crimes to publick Repentance, or of gross Crimes, untill they sent them first to the Superintendent. They were Solemnly Consecrated to the Office; And the Superintendant of Louthian, at his installing Anno 1560, is called by John Knox, the Pastor of the Church of Louthian, and these who represent that Country, promise to give obedience to him as becomes the Sheep to their Pastor. Neither were these Superintendents appointed at first for the Interim, in this sense, that after the Churches were once planted, such an *Imparity* should be totally abrogated, but rather that it should be more Regularly established. For in the Book of Church Policy it is said of the Election of Superintendents: 'Such is the present necessity that

"that the Examination & admission of Superintendents cannot be so strict
 'as afterwards it must; for the present we think it sufficient that the
 'Council Nominate so many as may serve the Provinces above written,
 'or then give Commission to men of best knowledge, who have the fear
 'of God, to do the same; the Gentlemen and Burgesles of Towns with-
 'in the Diocess being always made privy at this time to the Election,
 'as well to bring the Church in practice of her Liberty, as to make the
 'Pastours better favoured of the Flock, whom themselves have chosen.
 Again, it is there ordered 'that after the Church shall be established
 'and three years past, no man shall be called to the Office of Superin-
 'tendent who has not two years at least given a proof of his faithful
 'Labours in the Ministry of some Church. That they were liable to
 the censure of the Body of those over whom they Superintended, did not
 take away their Superiority and Superintendency over every particular
 Pastor, who was liable to the Censure of the Superintendent: that even
 where Popish Bishops embraced the Reformation they had Commis-
 sions given them to Ordain Ministers, & exerce Jurisdiction within their
 bounds, Mr. Petrie informs us. And to affirm, as the *Remarker* does,
 that the *Superintendents* were never honoured to be *Moderators* of the
 Assembly, is a piece of Confidence that none could be guilty of, but such
 as cannot be look'd out of Countenance, tho convicted of the most im-
 pudent falsehoods. The Office of Bishops was really used in *Scotland*
 till the year 1580 when it was abrogated by the Assembly at *Dundee*.
 And in their very act of Abrogation it is said, *Forasmuch as the Office*
of Bishops is now used within this Realm. And when, before that time,
 the name as well as the Office of Bishop was establish'd in this Church,
 care was taken that they should have no more power than the Superin-
 tendents had. So that by the acknowledgement of the Assembly the
 Office of Superintendent and Bishop was all one. It is evident then,
 that Episcopacy has been a far longer time owned by this Church than
 Presbytery; that for twenty years after the Reformation, whether under
 the name of Superintendents or Bishops, this Imparity continued till the
 year 1580. That tho some Provincial Synods were set up then in place
 of the outed Bishops and Superintendents in these Provinces, yet was
 there no Presbytery before the year 1586. Nor any of these Judicatories
 legally established, before 1592. and within eighteen years after that,
 or twenty, Bishops were again established by the Act of Assembly 1610.

and

and Ratified in Parliament 1612, and continued so the space of twenty eight years, till the Assembly at *Glasgow*, 1638. It hath then been longer own'd than Presbytery by this Church in times of Peace. It is becoming then, not to condemn this Reformed Church, as having in those times owned a Government unlawful and against the word of God.

If we will believe the *Remarker*, *Remark. 7, & 9.* There is no way to prevent Error but Presbyterie, and the Order of the Kirk of Scotland; and for this he Vouches the Authority of King *James* the VI. If Presbyterie was the Government established by Jesus Christ, how came they to suffer Episcopacy to be Established throughout the whole Catholick Church so soon after the Days of Christ and his Apostles, without remonstrating against it? It seems the Primitive Presbyterians have not been so zealous for this Government, as the Reformed *Soc's* presbyterians. Those were for Righteousness, Mercy, Faith and the Love of God; but these for the setting up of Christs External Kingly Power upon Earth. It seems the principles of the *Hind let loose* justifying the Horrid Murder of King *Charles* the I, and the Assassination of the Arch-Bishop of *St. Andrews*, are Innocent and Harmless principles; else all the Ministers, Presbyteries, Synods and General Assemblies would not have let it pass up and down among their People without condemning it, nor would they have received the Author of it into Ministerial Society without a publick recantation. But what if the Church Government be founded upon an Error? That it is the only Government establish'd by Christ in his Church? What if their standard of the Christian Religion keep out the most essential parts of Christianity? How shall the essential disorders of such a Constitution be redressed by the Presbyteries, Synods and General Assemblies? Every Good Tree bringeth forth Good Fruit.

One would have thought that of all men King *James* the VI, would have been the last whom the Presbyterians would have adduced for a Voucher of the great Blessing of Presbyterie. His sense of their Temper and Spirit is most truly declared by himself in his Instructions to his Son, Prince *Henry*, in his *Βασιλικὴν Δάσκαλιν* Lib. 2. As I here set them down in his own words. The natural Sickneses that have ever troubled and been the decay of all the Churches since the beginning of the World, changing the Candlestick from one to another, as *S. John* saith, have been Pride, Ambition and Avarice; and now lastly these same

Same Infirmities wrought the overthrow of the Popish Church in this
 Country and divers others. But the Reformation of Religion in *Scot-*
land being extraordinarily wrought by God, wherein, many things were
 inordinately done by a Popular Tumult and Rebellion, of such as blind-
 ly were doing the work of God, but clogg'd with their own Passions
 and particular Respects, as well appeared by the destruction of our
 Policy; and not proceeding from the Princes order, as it did in our
 Neighbour Country of *England*, as likeways in *Denmark*, and sundry
 other parts in *Germany*; some fierce Spirited Men in the Ministry
 got such a guiding of the People at that time of Confusion, as finding
 the Gift of Government sweet, they begouth to fantasie to themselves
 a Democrattick form of Government; and having (by the iniquity of
 time) been overwell baited upon the Wrack, first of my Grand-mo-
 ther, and next of my own Mother, and after usurping the Liberty of
 the time in my long Minority, settled themselves so fast upon the I-
 magined Democracy; as they fed themselves with the hope to become
Tribuni plebis, and so in a Popular Government by leading the people
 by the Nose, to bear the sway of all the Rule. And for this cause there
 never rose faction in the time of my Minority, nor trouble sensyne,
 but they that were upon the factious part were ever careful to per-
 swade and allure these unruly spirits among the Ministry, to spouse
 that quarrel as their own; wherethrough I was oft times calumniated
 in their popular Sermons, not for any evil or vice in me, but because I
 was a King, which they thought the highest evil. And because they
 were asham'd to profess this quarrel, they were busie to look narrow-
 ly in all my actions; and, I warrand you, a moat in my eye, yea a false
 report was matter enough for them to work upon: and yet for all
 their cunning, whereby they pretended to distinguish the lawfulness
 of the Office from the vice of the person; some of them would some-
 times snapper out well grosselie with the truth of their Intentions:
 informing the people that all Kings and Princes were naturaly Ene-
 mies to the Liberty of the Church, and could never patiently bear the
 yoke of Christ: with such sound Doctrine fed they their Flocks. And
 because the Learned, Grave and honest men of the Ministry, were e-
 ver asham'd and offended with their temerity and presumption, preas-
 sing by all good means by their Authority and example to reduce them
 to a greater moderation: there could be no way found out so meet in
 their

their conceit, that were turbulent Spirits among them, for maintaining their Plotts, as Parity in the Church: whereby the Ignorants were emboldened (as Bairdes) to cry the Learned, Godly and Modest out of it: Paritie's the Mother of Confusion, and Enemy to Unity which is the Mother of Order. For if by the Example thereof once Established in the Ecclesiastick Government, the Politick and Civil Estate should be drawn to the like, the great Confusion that thereupon would arise may easily be discerned. Take heed therefore (my Son) to such Puritans, very Pests in the Church and Common weal; whom no deserts can oblesse, neither Oaths nor Promises bind; breathing nothing but Sedition & Calumnies, aspiring without Measure, Rail- ing without Reason, & making their own Imaginations (without any warrand of the Word) the Square of their Conscience: I protest before the great God, and since I am here as upon my Testament, it is no place for me to lie in, that yee shall never find with any Hieland or Bordour Thieves greater Ingratitude, and more Lies and vile Per- juries, than with these Phanatick Spirits. And suffer not the Principals of them to brook your Land, if you like to sit at rest; except ye would keep them for trying your patience, as *Socrates* did an evil wise.

And for preservative against their poison, entertain and advance the Godly, Learned and modest men of the Ministry, whom of (God be Praised) there lacketh not a sufficient number: and by their Provision to Bishopricks and Benefices (annulling that vile Act of Annexation, if ye find it not done to your hand) yee shall not only banish their conceited Parity, whereof I have spoken, and their other imaginarie grounds; which can never stand with the Order of the Church, nor the peace of a Common-weal and well Ruled Monarchy: but ye shall also Re establish the Old Institution of the three Estates in Parliament, which can no otherways be done. But in this I hope (if God spare me days) to make you a fair entrie, allways where I leave, follow yee my Steps.

And to end my Advice anent the Church Estate, Cherish no Man more than a Good Pastour, hate no man more than a proud Puritan: thinking it one of your fairest Stiles to be called a *Loving Nourishing Father to the Church*; seeing all the Churches within your Dominion planted with good Pastors, the Schools (the Seminary of the Church)

maintained, the Doctrine and discipline preserved in Purity, according to Gods Word, a sufficient provision for their Sustentation, a comely order in their Policy, Pride punished, Humility advanced, and they so to Reverence their Superiours, and their Flocks them, as the flourishing of your Church in Piety, Peace and Learning, may be one of the chief points of your Earthly Glory; being ever alike ware with both the Extremities; as well as ye repress the vain Puritan, so not to suffer proud Papal Bishops: But as some for their qualities will deserve to be preferred before others, so chain them with such Bonds as may preserve that Estate from creeping to corruption.

This account given by K. *Ja. VI.* is a greater evidence that it was by the contentious Pride, and influence of some upon their brethren, that parity was settled here *Anno 1580.* and that from that time the beginning of all our confusions may be dated; than your Friends Reasoning *Rem. 9.* is a presumption against it; to wit, that such men would rather have used their influence to get themselves made Prelates; than to put all their Brethren, and keep them, in a Level with themselves. For, I doubt not he will grant that *Korah* and his Company had as much Pride and Ambition as these men, and yet they sought only to put all in a Level with themselves. They say to *Moses* and *Aaron*, *Numb. 16. 3.* *Yee take too much upon you, seeing all the Congregation are Holy, wherefore then lift you up yourselves above the Congregation of the Lord.*

In good earnest, Sir, does not the *Remarker* in his 9th. and 10th. *Rem.* give weighty Reasons why the Presbyterians thought fit in the Reign of K. *Ja. VI.* to be so uneasie to his Government, and in that of his Son to destroy the peace and prosperity of this *Island*. Why, K. *James*, by the Authority and consent of General Assemblies, introduced constant Moderators in Presbyteries and Synods (as the Ministers themselves had done in Church Sessions) which mightily offended some, tho' they could not produce one Authority, that they ought to be *Ambulatory*, either from the Scripture, or practice of the Church in any Age; he banish'd one or two Ministers for offering to hold a General Assembly, tho' he had appointed the adjournment of it to another time, and they give in a Declinator against the Authority of his Privy Council in that matter; tho' the Divine right of yearly Gen. Assemblies, can never be made appear; and the Reformed Church of *Holland* hath no General

Af-

Assemblies at all, and never to this day presum'd to hold any, without the consent of the States. And tho it was no Crime for the Parliament of England to pack an Assembly of Divines, and from that packt Assembly we must have a Large Confession and two large Catechisms to be the Standard of the Christian Religion; Yet it was a heinous crime in K. James that by the same Ecclesiastical Authority of Gen. Assemblies (which must be called packt for that reason) he settled a moderate Episcopacy, and some Rites in the Church, some of which were necessary, and others useful and decent; such as, that when Children are grown up, they should be brought in a solemn manner to renew their Baptismal Vow; Baptism should not be denied to dying Infants; nor the Holy Communion to dying Christians; that the most Solemn Act of Divine Worship, the Holy Communion, should be performed in the most reverend manner; & that the great mysteries of our Redemption, in the Incarnation, Death, Resurrection & Ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ, & the coming of the Holy Ghost, should be Solemnly commemorated yearly upon certain dayes set a part for that end (which were called the *Perth Articles*) if these were the terrible crimes, for which some Ministers thought fit to give such disturbance and confusion both to Church and State.

But his Son K. Charles his Crimes were yet more intolerable. All Churches of the World, have set forms of publick Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments: Calvin was so convinced of the convenience of this, that in his Letter to the Duke of Somerset Protector in England, in the Days of K. Edward the VI, he says: *As touching the Form of Prayer and Ceremonies of the Church, I approve very much that it be set, and that it bee not Lawful for the Ministers to recede from it in their Function, as well to help the Simplicity and Unskillfulness of some, as that the Uniformity of all the several Congregations may better appear: and finally, that the desultory and capricious Levity of such as affect Novelties may be encountered and stopped.* Martin Bucer, one of the most Famous among the Reformers, did so greatly approve of the Liturgy of the Church of England (as it is approved of by all the forraign Protestant Churches) that he declared, he saw nothing in it which is not taken out of the Word of God, or at least, which is not agreeable thereto. Now King Charles committed an unpardonable Crime, in appointing for Scotland a Set Form of Publick Prayers and

Administration of the Sacraments, in Substance the same with that of England; And every Church having some Rules and Canons for Government, he appointed some for the Church of Scotland. And tho' in the Protestant Episcopacy there is no more of the Pope, than there is of a Mass Priest in a Minister; or of a Conclave of Cardinal Presbyters in a Commission of the Gen. Ass. And the Scots Liturgy as well as the English, has no fibrels (as the Remarker phrase it) to the Romish Missal, but in so far as it is agreeable to the word of God (for if every thing must be thrown away that is contain'd in the Masse Book, then the Lords Prayer, the Apostles Creed &c. must be laid aside. I know not if it is for this reason that the Presbyterians have done so) and tho' the Canons being formed by the advice of some in England can be as little improv'd against the Sovereign Independency of this Nation, as the borrowing of our old Scots Liturgy and Presbyterian Government from Geneva, and the consulting of Beza about it, can infer any Dependence upon that State; or the borrowing the Westminster Confession and Catechisms from the Ass. of Divines in England could have been improv'd against the Sovereign Independency of this Nation. And tho' Arch-Bishop Spotswood's being advanced to the Chancellours Office, was in it self no greater Crime, than Mr. Robert Pont a Minister his being one of the Lords of Session approv'd of by the Gen. Assembly, and was against no Law of the Land; yet these were the great Crimes for which the prevailing partie then, did turn all into Confusion. And therefore the Remarker says, it is a base misrepresentation to say, that the discontented factions in the State, serving themselves of the Ministers to kindle and blow the Fire which destroyed the peace and prosperity of this Island, they concur'd with them to set up their beloved parity again. Now where the misrepresentation lies, I do not understand. Will he say there are no discontented Factions in the State? or that the Ministers did not blow the Fire, did not preach to the times? or that the Factions in the State did not help them to set up Parity again, and introduce it by force and violence? Ay! but the calling it their beloved parity is an evidence from the Author of the Case his own words, that Prelacy was hated by the then Ministry of Scotland, and Parity and Presbytery beloved. Why, it is well known there were factions in the Church as well as in the State, and these carried all before them, thrust out the Ministers who were most resolute against their

their practices, and made the rest to comply with them, partly upon plausible pretences, and partly out of Fear to be thrust from their Offices and Livings: and what fatal Mischiefs they brought both upon Church and State, I appeal to the Testimony of the Learned Dr. *Burnet's* Father, an eye witness of those times, as well as to his own *Mem. of the House of Hamilton*: and how much the generality of the Ministers, and of the people, groaned under this Tyranny, appeared from their ready embracing of the Episcopal Government of the Church upon its Restitution in 1662.

In the 11th. and 12th. Pages of the *Case &c.* it was said, that 'after the late Revolution, the Presbyterians got themselves seuled into a new form of Government, got the Church-Government established in the hands of, and exercised by, those [50] surviving Presbyterian Ministers who were outed since the first of *Janu.* 1661. and such Ministers and Elders only as they had admitted, or hereafter should admit or receive, with power thro' the whole Kingdom, to try and purge out all insufficient, negligent, scandalous and erroneous Ministers, and to redress all other Church Disorders; and so got all the rest of the Ministers of the Nation stript of the one half of their Ministerial Function, and absolutely subjected to their power and Authority: a kind of Imparity, never before heard of, and destructive to the very principles of Presbytery. To this the *Remarker* answers by asking two Questions, the one is, *what else could be done?* and the other, *would they not expect that the Parliament should put the Government in the hands of the Surviving Bishops, and such as they should assume, or would they put the Government into, or continue it in the hands of Presbyterian Ministers, whether they should conform or be assumed, or not?* Sir, You know it is ealie to give a distinct answer to these Questions; As to the last, you know the very nature of Episcopacy Requires that the chief administration of Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction should be in the Bishop; and therefore if some Presbyters refuse to concur in the exercise of it with the Bishop, when he requires nothing of them but what is Just, and will needs exercise it separately from him, they make a Schism: But the nature of Presbytery requires not that the Administration should be put into the hands of a Few, but of all the Presbyters within the Nation. And therefore for 50 Ministers to assume

N

and

and exercise the Church-Government exclusive of all the other Ministers of the Nation, except only whom they shall please to assume into a share of it, is an *Imparity* never before heard of, and destroys the principles of Presbytery. As to the first Question *what else could be done?* Sir, You know very well what both could and ought to have been done. Episcopacy being laid aside, the exercise of *Ecclesiastick Jurisdiction* remained in the hands of the Presbyters of all the Nation. It was a thing they could not be deprived of, without depriving them of their Office. You grant in your *Vindication of your Sermon*, P. 28. That *what God hath conjoyned, none can separate; none can mutilate the Office of a Presbyter, or the power that God has annexed to it.* Give me leave to ask you then, whether to the office of a Presbyter belongs not only the power to Preach the Gospel & to administer the Sacraments, but also the power of Ecclesiastick Jurisdiction? and if at the late Revolution, the Ministers then in Office were not vested with this power in Conjunction with their Bishops? These things then, as you acknowledge, which belongs to a Presbyter by virtue of the Order, cannot be taken away by any Church Prohibition. Will you not grant then, that this is a new sort of Prelacy, a set of Presbyters ruling over all the rest of the Presbyters, and mutilating that power which they confess cannot be separated from the Office of a Presbyter? Sir, Do you really in this, act according to your principles? Is it upon a State or Church principle? Is this Authority given you from Jesus Christ, or from the Gen. Ass. or from the State? Is not this, in good earnest, to be *State Prelates*, to assume Authority over the rest of your Brethren, whom you acknowledge to be Presbyters as you are, and you grant that no Church prohibition can take from their Office those things which belong to it *vi Ordinis*, by virtue of the Order. It is true, you have not said that this may not be taken away by a State Prohibition. And now indeed it cannot be denied but you practice Erastianism with a Witness. If it had been enacted, that the exercise of the *Presbyterian Government*, by Church Sessions, Presbyteries, Synods, Gen. Assemblies should be in the hands of all the Presbyters in Office thro the Nation, as being inseparable from their Office, would you have thought this an unjust Act and contrary to the Institution of Jesus Christ? I know you would not. Do you think the Defection was so great by the Establishment of *Episcopacy*, that they who were then in Office

Office, or were afterwards call'd to it, were no Ministers of Jesus Christ. I know you do it not. You know how your assuming of this Prelarick Power was reclaim'd against: how the Duke of *Hamilton* opposed it, that one of your Friends the late Earl of *Dundonald*, was sensible of your Iniquity in it to his Death, looking on you as a company of State Prelates: the late Viscount of *Stairs*, when some of the Episcopal Ministers had occasion to complain to him, in privat, of the hard measure: he said 'Twas true, his principle was Presbyterian, yet not such as to make him separate when Episcopal Government was Established; but that in this matter, he had freely told the Presbyterian Ministers that in this they acted contrary to the Fundamental principle of Presbyterianie, and he thought, he said, he understood the principles of Presbyterianie, as well as any of them. But it seems the Thirst of Empire and Domination, with a little of Revenge, and a Pride to have all the poor Episcopal Clergy truckling under you, and standing as Criminals at your Bar, with an itch to expose them to the World, as a Company of erroneous, Ignorant, Scandalous, and supinely negligent persons, thereby to set off your own excellent qualities, prevailed against all the Remonstrances of equity, principle and Conscience, *Si violandum est jus, regnandi Causa violandum est*, is an Axiom in the practice of Lesser Empires than *Rome*: & in the Ecclesiastick as well as the Civil. I do not in the least mean this of you, Sir, but of the Spirit of the Party in which you have unfortunately engaged your self, where a man must be carried along with the Stream, contrary to the dictates of his Reason and Conscience, and sees't in vain for him to struggle against both wind and tide.

Now, Sir, that in all this you have acted against the Nature of Presbyterian Government, and the Establishment of it in 1592. the foot on which you now stand, I shall adduce an Evidence that I hope you will not cast, and that is his late Majesty K. *William*, the greatest Friend to Presbyterianie that ever sat upon a Throne, & yet in whose Reign, some complained that the Rights, Liberties and Priviledges of the People of *Scotland*, as an Independent State, a Free People, and as partakers of the same Human Nature with others, were most trampled upon. Hear then his Testimony against your measures, in this following.

Copy of his Majesty King William's Letter to the General Assembly
January 1692.

"Right Reverend and Well-beloved, we greet you well. By our Letter in February last from the *Hague*, and by another in June from our Camp at *Anderlick*, directed to the Commission of the last General Assembly, we have signified our Care for the Settlement of the Church in this our Antient Kingdom of *Scotland*; and for bringing these Ministers, who formerly conform'd to Episcopacy, to an Union with you in the Church Government by Presbyterie, as it is now Established by Law. And tho we had fair assurance from the Commission, of their willingness to take in their Brethren into Ministerial Communion, yet there hath not been hitherto such a progress made in that matter as we could have expected.

"It is represented to us, that you are not a full General Assembly, there being as great a number of the Ministers of the Church of *Scotland*, as you are, who are not at all allowed to be represented, tho they were neither purged out, upon the heads mentioned in the Act of our Parliament, by the general meeting of their delegates, or by the last General Assembly, during which time there was no stop put to your Procedure or Trial. Yet we have signified our pleasure to those conform Ministers, not to insist upon that point, but to apply to you in the terms of a *Formula* and Declaration which we have delivered to our Commissioner, willing rather, that this Union may be the more Effectual and Cordial, that it should be an Act of your own to receive and assume into Church Government and Communion with you, such as shall address to you in these terms, and subscribe the Confession of Faith, which clears the soundness of their Principles, as to the Fundamental Articles of the Protestant Religion.

"We do assure you, it is not our meaning and Intention to protect Scandalous Ministers, and tho' there is more caution necessary in the admission of persons to Sacred Orders, than in allowing them the share of Government in the Church which is consequent to their Ministry; and that Scandals are neither to be presumed, nor lightly sustained against Presbyters; And these Ministers having some Months ago applied to the Commission, you might have opportunity to understand their Circumstances; And if any thing Scandalous should hereafter appear, they ought then to be turn'd out, notwithstanding you now receive

(57)

'receive them. By all which a trial in order to this Union at present
 'does not appear very necessary. Yet for your Satisfaction in that point,
 'we will not desire you to admit any that may apply, against whom
 'there may be a relevant accusation instantly instructed by sufficient
 'Legal proofs. But where no sufficient probations are adduced, we
 'judge it just and necessary that you admit those that apply, and are
 'not found Scandalous, and that the Trial may be in open Assembly. And
 'such, as are not justly found guilty, to be received before the General
 'Assembly rise. And in case there should be so many accusations brought
 'in, that there cannot be time to examine the proofs and advise the
 'same, during the ordinary time of the sitting of the General Assembly,
 'or that ye cannot be well absent from your Charges; In that case we
 'think fit and just that you appoint two Commissions, one to sit at *Edin-*
 '*burgh*, immediately after the rising of the General Assembly, for dis-
 'cussing such accusations as the General Assembly cannot overtake, that
 'may be brought against these conform Ministers who shall apply, and
 'do reside on the South side the River of *Tay*. And the other Commission
 'to sit at *Aberdeen*, within ten days after the rising of the General As-
 'sembly, to discuss such accusations as remain undetermined by the Ge-
 'neral Assembly against those Ministers residing on the North-side of the
 'River *Tay*, who shall apply to you. And that the Tryals may be
 'more impartial, expedite, and unsuspected, we think fit that the one
 'half of the Commissioners should be of you the Old Presbyterian Mi-
 'nisters, and the other half of Ministers who formerly conformed to
 'Episcopacy, and are to be received by you, against whom there is no
 'accusation. Which Commissions are to consist of 24 Ministers at least,
 'being 12 of either side, who are to sit without Interruption till they
 'determine those Accusations, which may be easily finished before
 '*Whitesunday* next. And we expect that you will discourage all Ma-
 'lice and Calumny, and proceed with diligence impartially, that these
 'who are worthy may be admitted, and such as are Scandalous Mini-
 'sters, whom we abhor, may be justly rejected, so as there may be a
 'full Representation of the whole Church in the next General Assem-
 'bly.

'We do likewise renew to you the assurance of our firm Inclinations
 'to protect you, and to maintain the Presbyterian Government in the
 'Church of that our Ancient Kingdom, Established by Law; and that
 'we

'we will not suffer Encroachments or Novelties to be obtruded upon it. And we do expect, that you will rest and depend upon this, and not suffer your selves to be imposed upon, by hot and violent Spirits, who would carry you from Moderation and Charity, upon design to continue the whole Government of the Church, in the hands of a part of the Ministers, which is both inconsistent with the Presbyterian Grounds, and the Plan of Church Government, established by Act of Parliament Anno 1592. and lately ratified by us in Parliament, which we will take care to have effectually observed.

'VVe have sent you the Earl of Lothian, as our Commissioner, in whom you have no reason of Diffidence, whom we trust as a person of great Integrity and Affection, both for our Service, and the welfare of the Church and Countrey. And not doubting, you will take these matters, which we have recommended to you, in the first place, to your care, That before you fall upon other Business, you may give a satisfactory answer to the premisses; VVe bid you heartily Farewell.

Given at Our Court at Kensington, January 7th 1692. and of Our Reign the third Year.

By His Majesties special Command,
Jo. Dalrymple.

DIRECTION,

To the Rev. and well beloved the Ministers and Elders of the General Assembly of the Church of our Antient Kingdom of Scotland.

The Formula of the Address to be made by those Ministers who formerly served under Episcopacy.

We underscribers, for ourselves and Constituents, Ministers of the Gospel, in Scotland,

Humbly Shew,

That since Episcopacy is abolished and Presbyterian Government established by Act of Parliament, as it was established in the year 1592. And we being desirous to exercise the Holy Function wherewith we are invested, in our several stations, for the glory of God, the Advancement of Religion, their Majesties Service and the peace of the Nation,

Do therefore humbly desire, that all stops and impediments may be taken off, so that we may be permitted to act as Presbyters, in Presbyteries.

byteries, Synods and Gen. Assemblies, in concurrence with the Presbyterian Government of the Church as now by Law Established.

The Test or Declaration to be Sign'd by all those who shall be assumed

I do sincerely declare and promise that I will submit to the Presbyterian Government of the Church as it is now by Law established in this Kingdom, under their Majesties *K. Wm. and Q. Ma.* by Presbyteries, Provincial Synods and a General Assembly; and that I will, as becomes a Minister of the Gospel, heartily concur with the said Government, for the suppressing of Sin and Wickedness, the promoting of Piety, and the purging of the Church of all erroneous and Scandalous Ministers. And I do further promise that I will Subscribe the Confession of Faith, and the larger and shorter Catechisms now confirmed by Acts of Parliament, as containing the Doctrine of the Protestant Religion professed in this Kingdom.

This is the exact Double of the Formula of Adress, and Declaration or Test, which his Majesty hath seen and approv'd.

Jo. Dalrymple

You see, Sir, King William declares that they were not a full General Assembly, there being as great a Number of the Ministers of the Church of Scotland as they were, who were not at all allowed to be represented; that to continue the whole Government of the Church in the hands of a part of the Ministers, is both inconsistent with the Presbyterian Grounds, and the Plan of Church Government established by Act of Parliament Anno 1592, and lately ratified in Parliament: recommends that they be not impos'd upon by hot and violent Spirits, to be carried away from Moderation and Charity, upon design to continue the whole Government of the Church in the Hands of a part of the Ministers; that they take care to have a full representation of the whole Church in the next General Assembly, and for that end to admit those that apply, upon the Formula he recommended, who are not justly found guilty before the Assembly rise. And that the Commissions, for trying of any against whom accusations shall be brought, should be the one half of the old Presbyterian Ministers, and the other of those who formerly conformed to Episcopacy, and were then to be received by them, against whom there is no accusation; that the Trials might be the

the more Impartial, expedite and unsuspected. He tells you that a Share of Government is consequent to their Ministry. Yet you continue still to retain the whole Government in the hands of a part of the Ministers, which is contrary to the design of the Law, and the Presbyterian Grounds, and the Plan of 1592, even King *William* being Judge, as well as it is contrary to Reason and Equity and the Nature of the Pastoral Office, as you grant. And therefore what is said in the 13th Page of the Case. "That the Presbyterian Ministers could not in Conscience & Equity exerce Authority, and Lord it over their Brethren, and Cite and Judge them before their Presbyteries, Synods and General Assemblies, where they are not allowed to Vote or to be represented; is upon the matter own'd by King *William* himself, and what you confess ought not to be; for you grant, *that the Power which God hath annexed to the Pastoral Office none can separate from it.* Therefore like an Ingenuous Man, tell your mind plainly in this, without a quibble.

Sir, in the 5th page of your *Vindication* you say, *that which others object anent Baptism & the Lords Supper are sufficiently answered by the Gentleman's Letter, and the Remarks on the Case.* I know you have much Business, and have runn over these papers hastily, and are willing it should be thought the answers are sufficient, and therefore have given your Approbation to them. Give me leave then to mind you of the state of the matter.

As to *Baptism*, the complaint is made in the 16 page, in behalf of the People of the Episcopal Perswasion, why they scruple the Presbyterian Communion, *because therein Baptism is made an Initiation into a particular Sect and Party, and not into the Catholick Church: by binding therein the Parents for themselves, and Infants, to the Westminster Confession, and Larger and Shorter Catechisms, as the Summary of the Christian Religion, to which they cannot consent, but to the terms of Initiation into the Catholick Church of Christ, owning the word of God contained in the Scriptures for the Rule of their Faith, and the Antient Apostolick Creed for the Symbol of it.* To this, the Gentleman's Answer in the 2d. Edition of his Letter P. 17. is, "That to pretend this, is absurd and ridiculous, and strikes as much against all Churches: At Baptism, the Ministers, saith he, oblige the Parents to own, and to engage to bring up their Children in the Faith of the Christian Reformed Religion, contained in the Scriptures, and more Summarly comprehended in the

Con-

Confession of Faith, the Larger and Shorter Catechism. Is this a Baptizing them into a Sect? Or are we Singular? Doth not every Church take the same Engagements with respect to the form of sound Words they have adopted? And is there not such a notable Harmony between our Confession and those of other Churches, as *England, Holland, Protestant Church of France, &c.* As may make a Man that has not already forfeit all Credit and Reputation blush, to cast such a Reproach and base Calumny upon the Church of *Scotland*? But saith he,

Cantabit vacuus coram Latrone viator.

I leave it to the Gentleman himself, to explain and apply his Latin Phrase and shew the pertinency of it; it is like, the poor stript Episcopal Minister is the Traveller with an empty purse, but let him tell whom he means by the Thief or Robber. As to the notable Harmony, between the *Westminster* Confession and those of other Churches, the judgement of *Geneva* appears, by this, That the Collection of the several Confessions of the Reformed Churches, called *Corpus & Syntagma Confessionum, &c.* being grown scarce, was Re-printed at *Geneva* 1654. In the first Edition were inserted the XXXIX Articles of the Church of *England*, as having publick Authority, and our Confession of Faith ratified by Act of Parliament in the Reign of K. *Ja. VI.* In this latter Edition, some moved to have them left out, and the New *Westminster* Confession put in stead thereof; but this Motion was wholly rejected, and the former continued, without so much as mentioning the *W. Confession*: tho' at the same time they added the Confession of *Cyrrillus* Patriarch of *Constantinople*; and that of the Reformed Churches of *Poland* and *Lithuania*, made by the General Assembly of *Thoren*, Anno 1645.

Sir, As to the base Calumny, whereof the Gentleman accuseth the Author of the *Case*, it is either in relating a matter of Fact that is not true, as to the manner of their Baptizing; and of this the Gentleman clears him, by telling the Manner of it: or it is in saying, that thereby they Baptize into a particular Sect; and that this is a base Calumny, the Gentleman proves, by asking, if every Church does not take the same Engagements with respect to the Form of Sound Words they have adopted? The Author of the *Case*, Edit. 2. p. 35. makes appear, That if the Gentleman had been a Minister, this would have been a very wilful Calumny against, for ought he knows, all the Churches in the

Christian world, the present *Scottish Presbyterians* only excepted: and for this end, he sets down there, the particular Forms of Baptism of several Churches, of *England*, the Protestant Church of *France*, and shews that in these and *Switzerland*, *Holland*, *Germany*, yea and in the Church of *Rome*, they do not require their belief of their particular Confessions but only of the Apostolick Creed, & the Baptismal Vow of Renouncing the Devil, the world & the flesh. And he makes appear, that as there cannot be a greater disservice done to the Religion of Jesus Christ, than to turn a School System, full of hard School Terms, into a Confession and Catechisms, and to set these for the Standart and the true exposition of the plain Doctrine of Christ, especially if these Standarts want the most necessary and essential parts of Christs Doctrins, so both these are made appear as to the said Standarts &c. Now to all this the Remarkers answers P. 40 That the Instances of the Church of *England*, and of the *French* Protestant Church, make against the Author of the *Case* and not for him; for it is plain, he says, they require their belief of the Apostolick Creed, as well as their belief of other particulars, and this is that Form of sound Words which that Church has adopted for that Purpose. And the *French* Church, he says, bind them to instruct the Child in the Doctrine that is received among the People of God (by which, saith he, no doubt they understand their own Confession) and that as it is Summarily comprehended in the Confession of Faith, &c. Sir, do you really think this a sufficient answer. The Church of *England*, tho' they have Thirty nine Articles, as a Symbol of the conformity of their Doctrine with other Reformed Churches, yet in Baptizing they require only the belief of the Apostolick Creed. The *French* Church, has a publick Confession also, consisting of several Articles, but the Confession of Faith, the Belief of which they require in Baptism, is only the Apostolick Creed, which they recite and say the Doctrine received among the People of God is Summarily comprehended in this Confession, to wit, I believe in God, the Father Almighty, &c. So the form of sound words of every Church which they Adopt for Initiation into the Church by Baptism, is the form of the Primitive and Catholick Church; Now this Form the Scots Presbyterians have laid aside, and require their Belief of 171 Articles of the *Westminster Confession of Faith*, and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, and if that is not the Baptizing into a particular Sect, I know not what is. In the

Case

Case, Edit. 2. page 36. It was said, 'That even those of the *Roman Church*, who are so ready to impose their new Creeds and Doctrines upon others, yet do not require the express Belief of their new Articles of Faith, as a condition of Initiation by Baptism into the Catholick Church, but keep only to the Articles of the Antient Apostolick Creed, and require them to Love God with all their Hearts, and their Neighbours as themselves: And what pleasant Banter your Friend makes of this, I leave you to judge. But as to the matter in hand, it is a matter of so great moment that you have need to lay it more to heart, as being that, tho' there were nothing more, which will be a continual occasion of Strife and Division in this Church. Mr. *Richard Baxter* before the Preface to his Catholick Theology, and in the Preface it self, does so sensibly represent the Nature and Terms of Initiation into the Church of Jesus Christ by Baptism, that I judge it no impertinence here to transcribe it. He states it as follows,

Affert. 1. The **BAPTISMAL COVENANT** expounded in the antient **CREED** is the summ and Symbol of Christianity, by which Believers were to be distinguished from unbelievers, and the outward profession of it was Mens Title to Church Communion, and the Heart-consent was their Title-condition of Pardon and Salvation; And to these ends it was made by Christ himself. *Math. 28. 19, 20. Mark, 16. 16.*

2. 'All that were Baptised, did profess to Believe in God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and devoted themselves to him, with profession of Repentance for former Sins, and renouncing the Lusts of the Flesh, the World and the Devil; professing to begin a New and Holy Life, in hope of Everlasting Glory.

3. 'This Form of Baptismal Covenanting and Profession begun with Christianity (and called our Christening or making us Christians) hath been propagated and delivered down to us to this day, by a full and certain Tradition and Testimony, and lesser Alterations than the Holy Scriptures.

4. 'The Apostles were never such Formalists & Friends to Ignorance and Hypocrisy, as to encourage the Baptised to take up, with the saying [I believe in the Father, Son and Holy Ghost] without teaching them to understand what they said. Therefore undoubtedly they expounded these three Articles: And that exposition could be no other

ther in sense than the Creed is. And when Paul reciteth the Articles of Christ, I Cor. 15. and mentioneth the *form of sound words*, we may be sure that they all gave the People *one unchanged exposition as to the sense*: Christianity was one unchanged thing.

5. Tho' I am not of their mind that think the twelve Apostles, each one, made an Article of the Apostles Creed, or that they formed and tied Men to just the very same Syllables, and every word that is now in the Creed : yet that they still kept to the same *sense*, and words so expressing it, as by their Variation might not endanger their corrupting of the Faith by a new Sense, is certain from the nature of the Case, and from the Agreement of all the Antient Creeds, which were ever professed at Baptism from their days; that cited by me (*Append. to the Reformed Pastor*) out of *Ireneus*, two out of *Tertullian*, that of *Marcellus* in *Epiphanius*, that expounded by *Cyril*, that in *Ruffinus*, the *Nicene*, and all mentioned by *Usher* and *Vossius*, agreeing thus far in sense, and no one was Baptised without the Creed professed.

6. As Christ himself was the Author of the Baptismal Creed and Covenant, so the Apostles were the Authors of that Exposition which they then used, and taught the Church to use: And they did that by the Holy Ghost, as much as their enditing of the Scripture.

7. Therefore the Church had a Summary and Symbol of Christianity (as I said before) about Twelve years before any Book of the New Testament was written: And this of Gods own making: which was ever agreed on, when many books of the New Testament were not yet agreed on.

8. Therefore Men were then to prove the truth of the Christian Religion, by its proper Evidences and Miracles, long before they were to prove that *every word* (or *any Book*) of the New Testament, was the infallible perfect word of God.

9. Therefore we must still follow the same Method, and take Christs Miracles to be primarily the proof of the Christian Religion, long before the New Testament Books were written.

10. Therefore if a Man should be tempted to doubt of the certainty of this or that Book, Words or Reading, it follows not that he must therefore doubt of the Christian Faith.

11. A Thousand Texts of Scripture may be not known and understood by one that's justified: but all the Baptismal Articles and Covenant, must be understood competently by all that will be saved. 12.

12. 'Those Church Tyrants, Dogmatists, or Superstitious ones, who deny the sufficiency of this Test and Symbol (made by Christ and his Spirit) to its proper use (to be the Symbol of such as in Love and Communion we are to take for Christians) do subvert the Sum of Christs Gospel and Law, and do worse than they that add to, or alter the lesser parts of the word of God.

13. 'Therefore, our further additional Confessions must be only to other subordinate ends; As, 1. To satisfy other Churches that doubt of our Right understanding of the Faith. 2. To be an Enumeration of Verities which Preachers shall not have leave to preach against (tho they subscribe them not.)

14. *Object.* Hereticks may profess the Baptismal Creed. *Ans.* 1. 'And Hereticks may profess any words that you can impose on them, taking them in their own sense. All the Councils are not large enough to keep out Subscribing Hereticks. We must not make new Symbols, Rules and Laws as oft as knaves will falsely profess or break the old ones: there being none that may not be falsely professed and violated. 2. Many subscribe to the whole Scriptures that are yet Hereticks. 3. 'Church Governours are for this, to cast out those, or to punish them, who Teach, Preach and live contrary to the certain and sufficient Rule which they profess. Judicatories are not to make new Laws, but to Punish men for breaking Laws. A heart-Heretick only, is no Heretick *in Foro Ecclesie*. He that teacheth Heresie must be proved so to do, and judged upon prooff: which may be don without new additional Symbols, Rules or Laws of Faith. So that all this contradicts not the sufficiency of the Baptismal Creed as the Symbol of Christian Love, Communion and concord. I thought meet, *says he*, to add this more fully to what I said in the Epistle, to convince men of the true terms of Union, and of the Heinous Sin of all the sorts of adding & Corrupting Overdoers, that divide us.

Now, Sir, I appeal to all the Churches in the Christian World, whether the present Presbyterian Church in Scotland, has not separated and divided themselves from all other Churches, from the Primitive, Apostolical practice of Divine Institution, in the very Initiation of persons into Christianity, by throwing away the Apostolick Creed ever used by all Churches in all Ages as the Symbol of Christianity, and setting up in its stead the *Westminster* Confession, and Larger and shorter Catechisms.

Q

Sir,

Sir, You say, *what is objected aient the Lords Supper is sufficiently answered by the same Gentleman and Remarker.* It was Objected, that 'it was ordinary with them to Excommunicat from the Lords Table, among the worst of sinners all men of the Prelatical Principles, and who 'had taken the Test and not repented for it. An Instance was given, and that you may know that the Relater is of known Integrity, you may, if you please, speak with him in *Mill's Square* in the stair within the Court on the West side, and in the upermost Storie save one. And the Author of a *Short Character &c.* P. 17. gives you a famous Instance at *Ferri-town* in *Galloway*, where many Presbyterian Ministers were present, particularly Mr. *Edgar, Verner, Boyd, Cameron, &c.* Where they debarred all who had taken that Godless Oath the Test, or were guilty of the *Soul damning Sin of Prelacy*; and tells that it was so don generally thro the Western Shires. And you may perhaps call to mind, how a very near Friend of yours, made Scruple to Baptize the Child of a certain Gentleman within his Parish, untill he should profess Repentance (I do not say publickly) for the Test, and expressly told him that it was the Presbyterian's Order.

That at the Revolution it was generally Preach'd thro' the Nation, not by one but, by many Presbyterian Preachers unto the people, that the Gospel had not been Preach'd to them for 28 years, is so notour a matter of Fact, that every body admires the confidence of the *Gentleman* and the *Remarker* in denying it. The *Gentleman* in the 2d. Edit. of his Letter P. 17. says it is a manifest Calumny to say Presbyterian Ministers Preach'd that impudent Lye, and he will have the Scribler to be reputed an impudent Liar for saying so. In the Postscript to the 2d. Edit. of the *Case* P. 35. 'It is said a man may speak an untruth, and not be 'an impudent Liar. And that there are Hundreds thro' the several parts 'of the Nation, who declare they heard them Preach so, and that if it were 'worth the while, hundreds of Testimonies might be adduced. Now the nimble turn your Friend the *Remarker* gives to this, P. 39. is a Sample of his *Leger demain* way of Writing. Now I am glad, says he, to find the Author brought to his Repentance, and to acknowledge that in saying so he spoke an untruth. You see, the Author acknowledges no such thing, tho if he had found it to be an untruth he would not have been asham'd to acknowledge it. Another wilful mistake of his in the same place is no less nimble. He seems, says he, to insinuat that the

Au.

Author of the Letter grants that a Presbyterian Minister did so Preach in the beginning of the Revolution thro many parts of the Nation. Whereas it is only said P. 35. of the Case that the Author of the Letter grants, that if any Presbyterian Minister did Preach so, it was an impudent Lie that they Preached. And how willing the Presbyterian Ministers are that the people believe this impudent Lie, you know very well, Sir, from the late Process of the Reverend Mr. James Grame Minister of Dumfermlin. Where when a few factious Incendiaries in his Parish had given in a complaint against him, wherein they said [the Parish was desolate and not under the Inspection of a Gospel Ministry] and when he desired of the Synod in Fife, that the Authors of the Reflexions on his Ministry might be Censured, and so gross and scandalous aspersions might be condemn'd, since this was a direct virulent Reflection, not only on him, but by necessary Consequence on whole Protestant Churches, where Parity among Pastors did not obtain. And he desired that the Synod might declare, it was not their design (by calling him Incumbent, the Title you know they gave to all the Episcopal Ministers when they honoured them with Citations before any of their Judicatories) to deny or question his being Minister of the Gospel to that Parish; the Synod would not vouchsafe to take any notice of these Requests.

Sir, the Author of the Examination having said that all that is material in the Sermon against the Toleration desired, be takes to be fully answered in the Case of the Episcopal Clergy, two things excepted, which he was to consider, you in the 2d. Page of your Vindication refer him to the Answer of the Case, or the Remarks upon it. And I refer you Sir, to the Case it self, and to this Paper, to convince you, that the Remarks are not worthy of the approbation of an honest and ingenuous man.

In the 12th. 13th. 14th. Pages of the Case it is made appear that the granting a Toleration and Indulgence to the Episcopal Clergy is a matter of Justice and Equity; and that if the State of the whole Barons or Burgesses of the Nation had met with such hard measure, they would have thought it worthy of the Consideration of the High Court of Parliament to have redress'd them. I shall not repeat here, what may be seen in the forecited place, and to which the Remarks replyes nothing to the purpose.

Again

Again; it is said, 'that the Episcopal Clergy are Lawfully Ordain'd Ministers of the Gospel, by their Office they are bound to Preach the Gospel, and the Estates and Government of a Christian Nation are bound in Justice and Equity to permit and protect them, while they give due subjection to the higher Powers, and in all things behave themselves quietly, and neither do nor Preach any thing tending to Sedition. To this, Rem. 14. he says nothing to the purpose. This you know is chiefly insisted upon by the Dissenters in England, since they cannot, say they, comply with a good conscience in what is required of them. This is the favour which you judged ought to have been done you, when laid aside for not taking the Test, and which you readily embrac'd when granted by K. James. There can no worse consequences follow upon it now, than were feared should have followed then. There can nothing be said against it, which is not equally valid and far more, against the Dissenters in England. Your Zeal against it seems contrary to the Spirit of Jesus Christ, who, when his Disciples told him that they had seen one casting out Devils in his Name, and they forbid him because he followed not them, said, Forbid him not. For he that is not against us, is on our part. Mark. 9. 38. And to that of St. Paul who saith, Philip. 1. 15. 16. 17. Some indeed Preach Christ even of envy and strife; and some also of Good will. The one Preach Christ of contention, not sincerely, supposing to add affliction to my bonds. But the other of Love, knowing that I am set for the defence of the Gospel. What then? Notwithstanding every way, whether in pretence, or in Truth, Christ is preached; and I therein do Rejoyce, yea and will Rejoyce.

Again; it is said P. 14. of the Case. 'That the Episcopal Clergy judge, they cannot with a good Conscience apply to be assum'd into the present Government of the Church, and so to Preach the Gospel. 1. Because it is a Church Government never before heard of, an Imparity without a Parallel, so many Ministers having, and exercising, Ecclesiastical power and Jurisdiction over the rest of the Ministers of the Nation, and Lording it over them. Now Sir, be pleas'd to give a clear and positive answer to this Case. What God hath conjoyned, you grant, none can separate (P. 28. of your Vindication) None can mutilate the Office, or take away the power which God hath annexed to it. The power of Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction is annex'd to the Pastoral Office, *Va Ordinis*, by vertue of the Order, and cannot be taken away by any Church

Church Prohibition. Many of the Episcopal Ministers of the Nation continue still Ministers of the Churches where they were Instituted; they had a share in the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction. You have debar'd them from all Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction within this Nation, and yet continue them still in their Office, and exercise Jurisdiction over them. Are not you then their Prelats? Have not you separated what God has conjoyned? Can any Church prohibition take away that that is due to them by vertue of the Order? Now, pray, weigh your *Remarkers* answers to this, and see how light they are. P. 33. he sayes, *to pretend this is an Imparity without a parallel, is both disingenuous and ridiculous;* and he gives his reason thus; *Is there, says he, any Imparity among Presbyterian Ministers?* and as for the Prelatical Ministers of the Nation, *so soon as they were received into Ministerial Communion, they were admitted to an equal share of the Government.* Sir, do you think this a solid answer? There are two Questions propos'd, the one about matter of Right; and the other, matter of Fact. The first is not, whether the Episcopal Ministers be Presbyterian Ministers, but whether they be Ministers of the Gospel of Jesus Christ? and consequently if that power that is annex'd to their Office can be separated from it? The second is not, whether there be any Imparity among Presbyterian Ministers, but whether there be any Imparity between Presbyterian and Episcopal Ministers, and the first be Prelates to the last? and rule and have Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction over them? Now for this matter of Fact, I hope you will not deny: & that it is contrary to the matter of Right which you acknowledge, is as evident. So you see on what side the disingenuity & ridiculousness lies. And whereas your Friend says, how the Prelatical Ministers can either have, or expect to have a share of the Government, till they be assumed, is beyond his Comprehension: It is beyond my Comprehension how the Presbyterian Ministers could in Conscience debar them from a share of the Government unless they had been Lawfully deprived from the Office of the Ministry; it being a Right that belongs to their Office, & for which there was no need of assumption by the Laws of Jesus Christ (what ever might have been by the Acts of the General Assembly) more than there was need to give them a new Ordination, which I think you will not readily affirm.

Now as to the affair of Mr. *Forbes* and Mr. *Irvin* (with which your Friend makes such a pother) their addressing for Assumption in the year

1592. for themselves and their constituents &c. I think there needs no more to clear that matter, but to know the History of it; to consider K. Williams Letter, and the *Formula* of the Address and Declaration proposed, to have been made by the Episcopal Clergy, as they are already set down in this Paper. You see K. William by his Letter seems convinced of great injustice done the *Episcopal Clergy*, reproaches the *Assembly* for not having redress'd it before that time; lets them know that they are not a full Representation of the Church of *Scotland*; tells them, the design of giving them the power they had, was not that a part only of the Ministers of the Church of *Scotland* should engross it, & the rest be excluded; lets them see how contrary their practice is to the Presbyterian Grounds, and to the establishment of Presbytery in the year 1592 (the foot on which they now stand) whereby all the Ministers of the Nation had an equal Interest in the Government: shews them the manifest partiality of making themselves the sole Judges of the Episcopal Clergy, and therefore Wills that their Commissions for that end may consist of an equal Number of Both. He prevails with some of the Episcopal Clergy not to stand upon their just Rights, but for the sake of Unity and peace to enter into the Government, and therefore allows of such a *Formula* of an *Address*, as asserts their Right, & desires the stops may be taken off that hinder it. And the *Formula* of a *Declaration* to be Sign'd by them, wherein they neither assert the Presbyterian Government to be the only Government of this Church, nor the *Westminster Confession* to be the Confession of their Faith; but promise to concur with the said Government for the suppressing of Sin and wickedness &c. And to subscribe the Confession of Faith, as containing the Doctrine of the Protestant Religion, &c. Now every Church has many particular Doctrines relating to the Faith, which are not Articles of Faith. Now, Sir, what reason your Friend has so to brave it, and to upbraid the Episcopal Clergy that they will not address to be assum'd by you upon your terms, Mr. Forbes and Mr. Irvin having Addressed in 92, I leave you to Judge.

But Sir, your Friend P. 33. 44. of his *Rem.* to justify this new Prelacy and usurpation, offers to state the matter, and to give a Historical account of the State of the Church here since the Reformation, and so pretends to put the matter beyond all Controversie: but he leaves the Controversie where it was, and rather makes it greater. That Prelacy was

(71)

was sent a packing at the Reformation is not true, as is evidently made appear already; This Imparity being the Government of the Church here after the Reformation for twenty years. That Prelacy was re-established in the year 1610 by a violent imposition is as false, it being by the Consent of a *General Assembly*. Neither is it true that the throwing out of *Episcopacy* and the establishing of *Presbytery* in the year 1638 was by a free and Lawful Assembly, countenanc'd by Authority: but by a packt Assembly, discharg'd by Authority, and yet flying in the face of it. The party afterwards animating the Nation to a Rebellion against their King, and to encourage their Neighbour Kingdom to resist and destroy him. Tho' they afterwards tamely yeilded up their pretended Divine Right of a General Assembly, to the Will and Command of an Usurper, *Oliver Cromwel*, and never offered to resume it again. That the supreme Magistrat has a secular power in Ecclesiastical affairs as well as Civil, all Reformed Churches grant, and own him to be *Custos utriusq; Tabulae*: That in the year 1662. K. Ch. II. with consent of Parliament restored *Episcopacy* formerly establish'd by Law, and by a Lawful General Assembly, was an act of Justice, and restoring the Church to its just Rights. That there should have been a new Ecclesiastick Act of a General Assembly was not necessary; those Rights having been formerly established by a Lawful General Assembly; and that which threw out its Rights being illegal. Besides the consent of the Generality of all the Ministers and people of the Nation was a more Authentick approbation of it, than an Act of a General Assembly could be. That to abjure *Episcopacy* as a thing unlawful in it self, is a Heresie, as has been made appear, and is contrary to the practice of the Primitive Church, and of the Christian Church in all Ages and all the Reformed Churches; so that, if by the Covevant it was abjured as unlawful, the *Presbyterians* have thereby declared themselves both Hetericks and Schismaticks, and separated themselves from the whole Catholick Church, both primitive & Modern; brought a dreadful guilt upon the Nation, are the Authors of all the mischiefs that have followed thereupon, are not truly the Ministers of this Church, and the Ministers of the Episcopal perswasion cannot enter with them, without being partakers both of their Heresie and Schism. And their profaning the Sacredness of Oaths by Swearing to a thing unlawful, abjuring Prelacy as Anti-christian, does no more free them from Schism, because

R. G.

cause of their observance of it, than it did justify *Herod* in cutting off the Head of *John the Baptist*, that he did it for his Oaths sake.

Notwithstanding then, of all that the *Remarker* says, it is most evident that the present Presbyterian Ministers in *Scot* and are *State Prelates*, and assume an Authority over their Brethren the *Episcopal Clergy*, which is not communicated to them from the Laws of *Jesus Christ*. For the *Episcopal Clergy* being lawfully ordained Ministers of *Jesus Christ*, within this Church; the power of *Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction* cannot be separated from their Office by the Laws of the Gospel; and therefore the Presbyterian Ministers could not assume this power of *Prelacy* over them, and strip them of all *Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction* within this Church by the Law of the Gospel. That in the time of *K. Charles the II.* Ministers were accountable to the Civil Magistrate, for all their Administrations, as *Head of the Church*, is false. That the power of the Civil Magistrate extends to Ministers as well as Laicks; That they are subject to his Authority, and may be punish'd by him if they do Evil, tho' it be in the exercise of their Office; That the Civil Magistrate has this Power, not as the Churches Serjeant and Executioner, to put in Execution the Sentences of the Church, but as Gods Minister, first to Judge and then to punish evil doers, and to encourage those that do well, are truths generally acknowledged by all, except the Abettors of the Papal and Anti-Christian Power and Tyranny, and these are not confin'd to the church of *Rome*. That the Civil Magistrate may sometimes assume more than is fit, is nothing strange; so may *Ecclesiasticks* and Church Men, *in ordine ad Spiritualia*, meddle with every matter of State, as they did in the days of *K. Charles the I.* and in the Glorious times of the *Covenant*. That Persons may disclaim a power and yet exercise it, is very ordinary, and thus King *William* hindred your Brethren from purging the Church so thoroughly of all the *Episcopal Clergy*, as otherwise they would have done. So that your Brethren are still *State Prelates*, since they assume a Power of *Prelacy* over their Brethren, that does not belong to them by the Law of *Jesus Christ*. That the *Test* imported no other, than owning such a power of the Civil Magistrate over persons and in matters Ecclesiastical, as has been generally owned by all the Protestant Churches, appear'd by the explanation given by Authority, *reserving the power of the Keyes as exercised for the first three Centuries*; without which explanation, the *Episcopal Clergy*

Clergy refused to Subscibe it: and to say, *this does not help, because they swore that they took the Oath in the true and genuine sense of the Words*, shews only the temper of some that would fain have others guilty: for when words may very well bear different senses, and Oaths are to be taken in the sense of the Imposers, and when the Imposers declare that this is the sense in which they understand the words, there is no contradiction between their taking the Oath in the true and genuine sense of the words, as they are explain'd by the Imposer. But I believe Sir, you will find a greater difficulty in justifying the manner of Imposing the Covenant, those who pleased being allow'd by Mrs. Henderson, Dickson and Cant before the Assembly at Glasgow, to declare that thereby they did not abjure Episcopacy or the Perth Articles: and immediatly thereafter the Assembly declared that these were abjured by it.

As to what he says in the said Rem. 11. concerning the Rabbling, that he never met with the Man that did approve it: That Government must be said to have approved the Barbarity of the Rabbling out the Ministers with their Families, which did never by any publick act to this day disapprove it; nor so much as once mention it in the Reasons of their publick Fasts among the Sins to be Confessed and Mourned for, as the Presbyterian Ministers have never done; but have done all to encourage that way, and are so vain of it, as in their publick prints to menace the civil Government with it again, if any Toleration should be allowed the Episcopal Clergy.

As to what he sayes of the Presbyterian Ministers going out by the Ad at Glasgow, there is such a Disparity between that, and the Rabbling way; that a plain account of the matter of Fact, will make it palpable. After the Reformation, the Law did still continue the Patronages of Churches as before, so that none had a legal Title to any Church or Benefice; unless he had a presentation from the Patron, and Collation from the Bishop, while Episcopacy was the legal Establishment; or from a Presbytery, after that Presbyterian Government began to prevail; and as it was still the Law, so it was the constant practice of the Nation, for many years after Presbytery was brought in, even in the Reign of King Charles the 1. till the year 1649, when the Ministers got Patronages abolished and popular Elections set up. When King Charles the II. was restored, in the first Session of Parliament, 1661, the legal

Rights of Patrons were again asserted, and in consequence of this, there was an Act of Parliament in 1662. 'Ordaining all Ministers who 'entred to the cure of any Parish, in or since the year 1649, to have no 'Right unto, nor to possess the Rents of any Benefice &c, for the crop '1662, nor any year following, but their places are *ipso jure* Vacant. 'But that this Act might not be prejudicial to any of these Ministers, 'it is declared by the same Act, that every Minister who shall obtain a 'presentation from the Lawful Patron, and have Collation from the 'Bishop of the Dioces where he liveth, betwixt and the 20 of *September*, 'shall thenceforth have Right to enjoy his Benefice &c, as freely as 'if he had been Legally presented thereto, at his first entry. And by the 'same Act, the respective Patrons were ordained to give presentations 'to all the present Incumbents, who in due time should make applicati- 'on to them for the same. So, the case considered by the Parliament was the Rights of Patrons, and the Act did not consider these Ministers as *presbyterians*, but only such as had possest themselves of such Bene- fices, from the year 49, so far as Laick patrons are concerned, and not a word of such as had entred before that year, tho' there were many such. Neither did the Act turn them out, but allowed them to obtain a Presentation from the Lawful Patrons. Notwithstanding, a great many of these Ministers (upon what principle, they know best them- selves) refus'd to take the benefit of the Law. And therefore the Privy Council meeting at *Glasgow*, after the term was Expired, decla- red all such Churches *ipso facto* Vacant. And immediatly upon the pub- lication of this Act, they forbore the Exercise of their Ministry, and deserted their Flocks, which as the Presbyterian Minister in the Coun- try affirms in his *Letter to a member of Parl. concerning Toleration*, they repented to their dying day. Now what is there in all this, like the barbarous and illegal Rabbling in the West?

In the Exercise of this Prelatical power which the Presbyterian Mi- nisters do assume, it was said, *they Lorded it over their Brethren*, and in the 32 P. of the Case there is some account given of the manner of their treatment of them; and among some Instances, mention was made of the Rev. Mr. *Grame* Minister of *Dumfermlin*, with respect to whom it is there said, 'that a man dare not Preach upon these words: *We are bought with a price &c.* but presently he is charged with He- resy, Libels are forg'd against him, he is hurried from one Judicatory to

to another, put upon the rack of an Inquisition, and at last deposed from his Ministry. To this the Remarker says Page 36. *he is confident none would believe any such thing, that has the least acquaintance with the Author, and the freedom he takes in Loading those whom he intends to blacken.* And that as for Mr. Grame, if he had injury done him, the superiour Judicatories of the Church redress'd his Grievances, and that the world is bound to believe, if others had observed Mr. Grame's measures, Justice would have been done them. Sir, our famous Grammarian, Mr. Kirkwood at Kelso, has given a specimen to the World, in the Printed account of his Process, what Justice is to be expected, which I confess gives a lively Idea of the Spirit by which some Courts and persons are acted: and were every one as indefatigably active in their own defence, as he was, and supported by such potent freinds, they might sometimes have justice done them. But how hard it is for an Episcopal Minister, to meet with just things from any of the Ecclesiastick Judicatories, Mr. Cowper, who was a Colleague to Mr. Grame, as well as Mr. Grame himself, and many others, are living Witnesses. And as for Mr. Grame's affair; I am sorry your Friend has the confidence to out face the truth of a matter of fact, to which I am sure he is no stranger. It is well known, Sir, the chief ground of Mr. Grame's Process was his Preaching on the foresaid words, and from them pressing on his hearers, the obligations they had to glorify God, *being bought with such a price*; Upon this, complaint was made to the Presbytery, and from them to the Synod, and when they had tofs'd him sufficiently between Presbyteries and Synods and Committees, at length they depose him, and upon his appeal to the General Assembly, and their reference to him to the Commission, after a tedious Process, the State of the Publick affairs, seeming a little more favourable for the Episcopal Clergy, the Commission indeed thought fit to repeal the Synodical Sentence, and that upon a pure informality in the Synods procedure, without condemning or censuring the Grounds of the Sentence. Nay, the Commission did in effect justify the Synod in the Doctrinal point, that was mainly insisted upon. The chief Article, you know, of the Synod's Sentence of Deposition runs thus: *The Synod found that he erroneously judges that Christ died for all those that profess the Gospel, and to whom it comes; and that they are bought with a price; and maintains that Christ died in the Room and stead of all those for whom he died, and*

that

that he hath purchased pardon and salvation for them, conditionally, for whom he died, upon their believing and Repentance. And you know the Commission in the repealing of the Synodical Sentence, they take it off, because the Synod had not proceeded so regularly or orderly, as the Commission could approve thereof; But at the same time, the Commission takes occasion to give their Testimony to the Doctrine of this Church, according to the Confession of Faith, particularly these Truths which concern the extent of the Death of Christ; and for this end, they declare their dissatisfaction with the said M. J. Grame, for Preaching any Opinions, contrary thereto; in special, that the Death and Satisfaction of Christ is extended to all to whom the offer of the Gospel comes: and the Commission sharply rebuked the said Mr. J. Gr. therefore. And for the late Gen. Assembly, it is well known that they did not approve the proceedings of the Commission; so that upon the whole, both the Commission and the Assembly are of the same sentiments with the Synod. And as to the redressing of his Grievances, some of which you know were, that his Accusers in their Petition had cast vile aspersions on his Ministry, saying [this Parish was desolate, and not under the Inspection of a Gospel Ministry] for which he desired they might be censured; or that at least, the Synod would give their Verdict on them, before a final Sentence, but it was denyed him. He pleaded, that the particular Acts on which the Libel was pretended to be founded, and by which he was to be tried, might be specified; but neither Presbytery nor Synod would grant this; he complain'd that they erected as 'twere a Tribunal of Inquisition, and studied to entangle and torture him with Query upon Query, utterly alien from the business, that they might discover those Errours in his secret Sentiments, which could not be found in the Doctrine he taught. These and many other Grievances he complained of, but no regard was had to them. This, Sir, is well known to you, tho' you was far from approving the treatment he met with.

Sir, It was told, in the Case of the Episcopal Clergy; 'That the terms of assumption are such as they cannot in conscience comply with. As '1. They cannot Sign the Westminster Confession of Faith, as the Confession of their Faith. The Remarker still thinks he has got advantage by this, to brand them for Arminians. If it be Arminianism, to believe That God created man for this end, that he might love him, and enjoy him
for

him for ever; that man destroyed himself, and in God only is his help found; that God takes no pleasure in the death of a Sinner but rather that he repent and Live; that he is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance; that he so Loved the World, that he sent his only begotten Son, that whosoever believes in him might not Perish, but have everlasting life; that he sent not his Son to condemn the World; but that the World thro' him might be saved; that the Son of man came to seek and to save that which was lost; that when he shall say to the Righteous, that he shall surely live; if he trust to his own righteousness and commit iniquity, all his righteousness shall not be remembered, but for his Iniquity he shall die; if he turn from his Sins and do that which is Lawful and right, none of his Sins shall be remembered to him, he shall surely live: that all our good comes from God, and all our evil from our selves. If this be Arminianism, they are not ashamed to own it; for these are the great Truths of God revealed in his word; But to pry into the hidden decrees of God, and to speak peremptorily of them, is a thing they dare not meddle with, for *secret things belong unto the Lord, and only things revealed*, and the plain rules of our duty, to us and our Children; And Calvin and Arminius both with their respective followers (who, you know, are Presbyterian on both sides) would have done more service to Christianity, by learning themselves, and teaching others, how to deny themselves, and take up their Cross and follow Christ Jesus; than to contend about the method of the Divine Decrees, which no humane understanding can fathom. But in the 33. Page of the *Case*, there are reasons given why the Episcopal Clergy cannot sign that Confession, as the Confession of their Faith, which the *Remarker* thinks not fit to meddle with, only as to one reason, he says it *strikes as much against the Church of England, or any other Church*. The Church of England has made her Articles few, and does not reckon them all Articles of Faith, but Doctrines relating to the Faith. And the *Confessions* generally of the Churches have been formed chiefly to satisfy others that doubt of their right understanding of the Faith. But to impose so large a Confession, consisting of 170 Articles and each of these of many Doctrinal propositions, and to require every Ministers belief of them, as a Truth of Faith, is a piece of Ecclesiastick Tyranny that far out-vies Rome it self, and which lays the Foundation of inevitable Schism, and divisions; for no man of an ingenuous mind, that has not

been train'd into the bigotry of the Party, will ever Sign such a System by the bulk, & every Proposition of it, as the Confession of his Faith. And how nice your Brethren are in this point, appears by their Sentence of Deposition of Mr. Grame; where one Article of his Guilt is, *that tho' he was charg'd with Heterodoxy in his Doctrin and opinions, and for his Vindication was required to Subscribe the confession of Faith, as the confession of his Faith; yet he declared he could not Subscribe it, except in a qualified sense, which qualified sense he was not pleased to express to the Synod, but made delays about it; adding further that he believed the brethren themselves would not say, that it is necessary to believe every single proposition in the confession of Faith, to be a Divine Truth.*

There is a vast difference between Articles of Faith, and particular Doctrines and opinions relating to those Articles. The first you know, in the Primitive Church were few; and as to the second, men may differ in their opinions without destroying the Faith; and therefore to turn the particular Opinions and Doctrines of a Party into Articles of Faith, is to confound the Faith, to creat Schisms, and destroy Charity. And none can impose these Forms and Confessions on others, as their Faith, unless either they think the composers of them infallible, or that all men have the same measure of understanding, and judge alike of these things, or that they will needs force all to be of their opinion, or at least make them declare they are so (and so make them Hypocrites) or that we think they cannot be true Christians, or at least Ministers of Jesus Christ, unless they firmly believe all the opinions set down in these Forms, as Articles of their Faith, all which are most unreasonable. And how far the *Scotts* Presbyterians exceed in this Tyranny, I think I may leave to your self to judge.

2. It is told in the *Case* P. 15. 'that the *Episcopal Clergy* cannot declare in Conscience that the present Kirk Government, is the only Government of Christs Church in this Kingdom. The *Remarker* P. 17. in resuming it, speaks thus: *He (viz. the Author of the Case) pretends they cannot in conscience declare that the Kirk Government is the only Government of the Church in this Kingdom established by Law. Will this Gentleman, sayes the Remarker, pretend the Episcopal Government has still a Legal Establishment here?* In the Postscript of the *Case* p. 33. It was told him he was mistaken, and that the meaning was, that they cannot in conscience declare that this is the only Government

verment that Christ has establish'd in his Church, in this or any other Kingdom. The *Remarker* in his Postscript p. 37. affirms that he is *not* mistaken in saying, that the Formula requires of them that are to be Assumed into Ministerial Communion, that they own & acknowledge the Kirk Government to be the only Government of the Church in this Kingdom established by Law. Sir, do you really think the *Remarker* ingenuous in his manners? What is this but to Shuffle, disguise and misrepresent the matter. The *Question* is not whether the Presbyterian Government and no other Form, has at present the Civil Sanction in this Kingdom? But whether the Presbyterian Government of this Church now settled by Law, be the only Government of the Church, as it is worded in the Instructions to the Commission of the Gen. Assembly - 94. According to the *Remarker*, the Episcopal and Presbyterian Government stand on the same foot, as to the one or the others being the only Government of this Church; for the former has been, at least, as well, and as long favoured by the Civil Sanction as the Later. And so the one and the other by turns must be own'd to have been the only Government of this Church, meerly by Parliamentary Authority. Sir, it is like you will speak the mind of the brethren honestly and candidly in this point, and let the Episcopal Clergy know if any more be intended, but that they should acknowledge, that now you have the Law and the Civil Sanction upon your side, to make your Government the only Government of this Church. The *Remarker* seems to grant that there is no warrant for *Lay Elders* to sit and judge of the soundness of Ministers Doctrine, and principles; And *Blondel*, and the greatest Patrons of Presbytery and Mr. *Corbet*, Mr. *Baxter* and others, as well as those of the Episcopal persuasion, found as little warrant from the Scriptures, or the Primitive practice, for any such stated Office bearers in the Church of God.

3. It is told in the *Case* 'they cannot in their practice conform to the 'uniformity of Worship as it is now established and practised by the 'Presbyterians. They cannot despise their Masters Command, and the 'practice of all Churches, by casting out the Lords Prayer out of the 'publick Devotions of the Church; they cannot Preach in all things 'their Doctrine. And as to the people of the Episcopal persuasion it 'is said P. 17. of the *Case*, that in many things they cannot approve the 'Doctrine of the Presbyterian Ministers, nor look upon it as the Doctrine of Jesus Christ. The *Remarker* asks once and again, *what Doctrine is*

is Presbyterian Ministers Preach, which they cannot, and which they do not look upon, as the Doctrine of Jesus Christ. They cannot Preach that the New or Gospel Covenant is not Conditional. For they are fully convinc'd, and steadfastly believe that Remission of Sin, or Justification and eternal Life, are offered, and cannot be obtain'd but upon certain Conditions. They cannot Preach that *Repentance and new obedience, and Holiness* of Heart and Life are not conditions of Justification as well as Faith; And to Preach so, they are perswaded is contrary to the plain Tenor of the Scripture, and tends directly to debauch the minds and manners of Christians, who have so little sense or honest heartedness, as to believe their mistaken and unhappy Guides. They cannot preach down, or decry *moral Virtue*, lest they should undermine and supplant one of the great designs of the Gospel, and really defame and bring a Scandal upon Christianity. They cannot Preach that any Faith justifies, but as it *works by Love*, and produces the Fruit of Good Works. They cannot Preach that Good Christians have not such an *inherent Righteousness* as constitutes them Righteous, both before Men, and in the Judgement of God. They cannot but preach, that this *Righteousness* can no more be without holy and vertuous Actions, than the Sun without Light: But yet still they preach, that the holiest man in the world, cannot, by vertue of his inherent Righteousness, undergo the Tryal of Divine Justice, and must be absolved from Guilt and punishment by the mere Mercy of God, on the account of *Christ's Righteousness and Satisfaction*. They cannot preach that *Christ* died only for the Elect, a Doctrine not only contrary to the expresse letter of the Scripture, but absolutely inconsistent with the promiscuous offer of Pardon and Salvation to all, that's prescribed and warranted by the Gospel. They cannot preach, that an *irresistible measure of Grace* is necessary to Man's Salvation or Conversion, being perswaded that God, and the Consciences of finally impenitent sinners, will condemn them for not improving the Means and Opportunity of Salvation; which certainly they never had, if irresistible Grace be withheld from them, as undoubtedly it is. They cannot preach, that God sends the Gospel to *blind, harden and damn* any of those to whom it is preached. They cannot preach, that those whom God calls by his Ministers to believe and obey the Gospel, and to whom he promises pardon and salvation thro' *Christ*, upon condition of Faith, Repentance, and perseverance to the end; they

They cannot, I say, Preach that those are barr'd by an *absolute peremptory decree*, from all Hope of Mercy and Saving Grace; a Doctrine contrary, not only to the Promise, Declaration and Protestation, but even to the solemn Oath of God himself. They cannot preach that there is no greater Sin in a Believer than to *want assurance*, and to sit contented with the want of it. Other points might be named, but these may serve as a sample. Whoever are chargeable with such Doctrines as are here disclaimed, we are constrained by the Authority of Scripture, and the Evidence of Reason, to hold as Corrupters of the Christian Religion, and plain Seducers of Souls. We should be glad to see the Presbyterian Brethren disowning and condemning such pernicious Tenets. But till this be made appear by some publick and Authentick Deed, it cannot be thought unjust or uncharitable to load them with the imputation of the most pernicious Herodoxy; even such as gives a most unlovely *Idea* of the Divine Nature, & leads men to take up with the Form, instead of the Power of Godliness.

That Maxims and Doctrines, prejudicial to Piety and Vertue, are Generally vented from the Presbyterian Pulpits, is the Complaint of the more Sober and intelligent part of the Nation. And in effect, the *Catechism*, which all your Brethren teach, and so extravagantly extoll, seems to be no way fitted for the Instruction and Edification of People. It looks rather like a Compendious System of the Crabbed Divinity of the Schools, than a form of sound words, or an abstract of pure simple Christianity. And tho' it were Solid, Plain and Easy, as most certainly it is not, yet it could never be esteemed proper for grounding, and advancing Souls in Christian Wisdom and Goodness, it being Notoriously and Scandalously defective in the most Fundamentall duties of the Christian Life, Self Denial, taking up our Cross, following Christs Example, Loving our Enemies &c. To say nothing of the Compilers Slighting and Leaving out the *Summary* of Christian Faith, commonly called the *Apostles Creed*, that for so many Ages has been universally received among Christians.

And whereas the *Remarker* asks p. 37. What Doctrine is it the Presbyterian Ministers Preach, for which they would be censured, if they should not Preach it: Mr. *Grames Process* is an evidence of some such Doctrines: the Dangerous and Erroneous Doctrine he taught, and for which he was censured, was, you know, that Christ by his Death

has purchased Pardon and Salvation, for all to whom the Gospel comes, Conditionally, upon their Believing and Repentance. In one of his Papers to the Synod of Fyfe, he had cited a passage of *Calvine*, concerning Gods way of dealing with Reprobates, which runs thus: [*Ece vocem ad eos dirigit, sed ut magis obsurdescant; Lucem accendit, sed ut reddantur ceciores; Doctrinam profert, sed qua magis obstupescant.* Instit. L. 3. c. 24. Sect. 13.] This appearing choaking and horrid, Mr. Gr. smoothed it by a charitable Gloss, that the Author intended only to represent what was the Issue of the Offers of Mercy and Grace, thro' the perverseness of Sinners, and not that it was Gods design by the Light of the Gospel, to Blind, Harden and Damn any Man. This the Synod quarrelled and pos'd him, *If he believ'd that the judicial Blinding and Hardening of Men by the Preached Gospel, was not design'd by God, wherever it falls out?* ---He was likeways interrogated, *If New Obedience as well as Faith be the Condition of our Justification before God.* As the Committee of Kircaldy had put the same question to him before; *Whether or not he makes new Obedience to be a part of the Condition of the Covenant of Grace requir'd of Sinners in order to Justification?* This is the Orthodox Doctrine for which they are censured, if they do not Preach it, *That New Obedience is no part of the Condition of Justification.* If Men may be justified without Obedience, then undoubtedly they may be saved without it too, since whoever is in a State of Justification must be own'd to be in a state of Salvation. And what can be contriv'd more proper to flatter and Sooth Men in their Sins, and to encourage them with Hopes of Happiness, by meer Trusting and Relying on Christ, while they are utter Strangers to his Life and Spirit.

It had been said in the *Case* p. 18. (to make appear that the Presbyterians have been, from the first, the actual Schismatics and the Authors and Caufers of the Schism) "That notwithstanding of all the Changes that has been in matter of Church Government, yet both the Ministers and the People of the Respective parties, chose generally to hold Communion with one another, till about the year 1666; when the Presbyterians, without any New occasion given, on a Sudden broke off, and set up themselves into a separated party from the National Church. The Gentleman in the postscript of his Letter p. 20. says to this: *Habemus contentes reos; what imaginable scruple can those*

those of the Episcopal Perswasion pretend to have now which they had not before---66. Did not Presbyterian Ministers before that time as well as now --- perform all the Religious Offices in the same manner, and therefore the Ministers and People of the Episcopal Perswasion have not the Conscience they had before --- 66. In the postscript of the *Case Edit. 2d.* It was said "This way of reasoning was not intelligible. The Presbyterians are charged with the dreadful guilt of making a Schism in this Church, which was not made before, notwithstanding of the alternative changes in Church Government, and the Gentleman does not offer to clear them of this Guilt; but he will needs infer, that because the Author of the *Case* grants there was no actual Schism, notwithstanding of the several Changes, till the Presbyterians made it, therefore those of the Episcopal Perswasion ought to joyn with them, which is a very ill inference. For the Presbyterians did about that time state themselves actual Schismatics, without any new and just occasion given them, which they did not formerly at the Establishment of Episcopacy anno 1610. And they continued in this Schismatical state for many years, which I know you did not then approve, and they have never hitherto shewn any sense they have of their great guilt therein; and therefore for those of the Episcopal Perswasion to joyn with them, because they have the Countenance of the Civil Government, were to partake with them in their Sin; especially when they have set up a new form of Government (which was not done in the former erecting of Presbytery) & have laid aside the primitive Symbols of Christianity, the Apostolick Creed and the Lords Prayer, and made a new Confession of Faith (quite different from the Confession of the first Reformers in Scotland, to which they were bound by the National Covenant, which Confession also was in force for many years after Presbytery was last erected in 1638) and require all the Ministers to sign it as the Confession of their Faith, and all the People to receive it as the Standard of Christianity; practices which the Presbyterians of the former State, did not introduce; so that I may appeal to any unbiassed Person, whether those of the Episcopal Perswasion have not just reason not to joyn with such a party.

The Remarker p. 47 says, *His Arguments cannot be retorted upon the Presbyterians, as equally striking against them who scrupled to bear the Prelatists, because their hearing of them was required as a Test of their*

their Approbation of Prelacy: and for this cites a part of an Act of Parliament Ch. 11. Par. 1. Sess. 3. Act 1.

Now, Sir, observe your Friends pleasant reasoning from this: *Men of Tender Consciences have been always careful to shun every thing that might be constructed an owning of that which they judg'd sinful; especially to avoid these things which by Authority were required of them as Testimonies of their approbation of what they judged Sinful.* And seeing *Presbyterians* look'd upon *Prelacy* as a thing Sinful, and found themselves by their Solemn Covenants obliged, not only not to own it, but to disown it, and to oppose it, and their joyning with *Prelatical Ministers*, by the abovenamed Act, was required of them as an evidence of their Approbation of his Maj. Gov. *Ecclesiastical*: few of them had any freedom to do it, yea none of them did it, where they could find a *Presbyterian Minister* to joyn with, &c. Sir, I doubt not but you will answer this reasoning, by your Self, and justify your own practice, as you may very well do, and that of many Pious *Presbyterian Ministers*; such as *Mr. Hutcheson*, *Mr. Douglas*, *Mr. Cant* and many others, who never separated from the Publick worship, notwithstanding of the Re-establishment of *Episcopacy*, nor found themselves obliged by the Covenant so to do, for no Oath (suppose it had been implied in it, as it was not) can make that unlawful, that is antecedently a Duty, neither can Authority's requiring it as an Evidence of their approbation of his Majesties Government *Ecclesiastical*, be a sufficient Reason to decline it, if it be otherways a Duty; no more than it were lawful for a Man to put away his Wife, because the King requires a Man to cohabite with his Wife, as a Testimony of his Acknowledgement of His Majesties *absolute Authority*; nor is it lawful for Men of tender Conscience, to shun every thing, that might be constructed, an owning of that, which they judge sinful; nor did ever any Church in the World, judge *Episcopacy* unlawful & sinful, far less swear against it as such, except the *Scots Presbyterians*; Tho the *Presbyterians* in *England* were far from thinking, that they had abjured *Episcopacy* by the solemn League; nor did the *Ministers* in *Scotland*, before the Assembly 1638, judge that they had abjur'd it by the National Covenant; And it is an unprecedented Practice for a General Assembly authoritatively to determine the sense of an

an Oath, contrary to the meaning of the first Imposers, and of all the Subscribers from that time downwards to the Assembly. As to the time of the actual separation of the Presbyterians, whether it was about 66, or as the Author dates it from 62, it is not material; But it is most evident, that the Presbyterians are the Schismatics and the Authors of the Schism.

Sir, The Argument used by your Friends against a Toleration, to these of the Episcopal Perswasion, is, That it would *open a Door to all Vice and Immorality, &c.* It was ask'd in the Case, &c. 'If this abounds more in the united Provinces, than in this Nation? And 'if the Presbyterians were afraid, lest the general Toleration, granted by K. James, should open a Door to all Scandals, and Errours, and destroy Church Discipline, how came they to embrace it? Their tender Consciences made them not careful to shun that, that might be constructed an owning of that which they judged sinful; K. James His absolute Authority and dispensing Power; as in the beginning of K. Ch. His Reign, they forbore to come to Church, lest it should be constructed an owning of His Government Ecclesiastical; They give the King publick Thanks for it, without ever remonstrating against the absolute Power assumed, or the setting up the Popish Idolatry, and opening a Door to all Errour. If there were but five or six Ministers that returned their hearty thanks to K. James for this surprising Favour (as the *Remarker* affirms P. 22.) Yet they declare, they did it in the Name, and by the Order of the rest of their Brethren (in which I hope, he will not say, they lyed.) For Answer to the first, your Friend (P 20. 21.) will have all the vicious People in this Nation, to be upon the Episcopal Side, and that Impiety is no more suppressed, *to be owing to the disaffected Party.* And as to the second, That the Presbyterians found the Door open'd to all Errours and Immorality and the Discipline of the Church quite destroyed ere that Toleration was granted. Sir, The great Politick of your Party, is to insinuate to the World, that Orthodoxy and Piety, is wholly on your Side, & Errour, Impiety, Immorality and Prophaneness, altogether on the other Side. I do heartily wish there were less of these last on either Side. But in good earnest, Sir, will you say, That none of the notorious Drunkards, Swearers, or Whoremongers, &c. own themselves Presbyterians, and set up to be very zealous for it? were not some of

the leading Men, when Presbytery was last rampant, such to a Proverb? and that without any *Last of Church Discipline*? And is the matter much mended in this Age? Besides, your Remarkers reasoning may rather be an Argument for Toleration; for then you will have all the Pious, Orthodox and Godly on your Side, and your Partie will not be full of Hypocrites, as it is now, and all the impious, and the profane will be on the other Side. And if you desire a few good, rather than many wicked to joyn with you, you will plead for a Toleration. The Remarker somewhere complains, that they teach the Children to scoff the Presb...; and call them by names, and he resolves, it seems, to be even with them, by inventing new Nick-names for the profane, naming them by the horrid Oaths they swear, which ought not to be spoken of amongst Christians, far less turned into Nick-names, as the Remarker does p. 20. 21. Whether this is the pulpit way of your Friends, I know not; but I am sure it is not becoming. But then, Sir, there is another List of immoral persons, who tho their Vices are not so odious before Men, yet they are so in the sight of GOD, and there is many times less hope of their Repentance and Recovery, and if fewer of this sort abound among you, you have reason to Bless God; if otherwise, you have no ground of boasting. This is the List reckoned up by S. Paul, II. Tim. 3. 1. &c. Who tells us that *in the last Days, perillous times shall come, for Men shall be Lovers of their own Selves, Covetous, Proud, Boasters, Blasphemers, Disobedient to Parents, Unthankful, Unholy, without Natural affection, Truce-breakers, Falseaccusers, Incontinent, Fierce, Despisers of those that are Good, Traitors; Heady, High-minded, Lovers of Pleasures more than Lovers of God, having a form of Godliness but denying the Power thereof, from such turn away.*

As for the Presbyterian Ministers that Preach'd at the peril of their Lives before King James his Toleration; these were not generally the presbyterian Ministers who embraced it, but they were of a certain company, whose principles and practices, the Remarker says p. 22, were hateful to the presbyterians, and looked upon the presbyterian Ministers who accepted the Toleration, as Betrayers of their principles and their Religion, as may be seen by the Character given them in the *Hind let Loose*.

That

That there is *more reason for granting a Toleration to the Episcopal Clergy in Scotland than the Dissenters in England*, appears both from this, & the former part of the *Case*. That it makes *them less capable of doing prejudice to the National Church there; that there are many parties of Dissenters is not true*; For they can all associate in that design, as well as the Presbyterians in *Scotland and England* and the Independants did all joyn in a Solemn League and Covenant, for the Church of *England's* overthrow in their former Association.

Sir, your Brethren might have pleaded against a Toleration without libelling the *Parliament of England*, as your *Remarker* p. 31. And the Author of the *Essay upon Toleration* p. 22. have indiscreetly done; the last expressly asserting that *the House of Commons in England were endeavouring to take away the Liberty the presbyterian Dissenters had by Law*. Both these Gentlemen say that *the Church of England is sufficiently secured by the Sacramental Test*, and the House of Commons aim'd at nothing but to make that Test a sufficient security, reserving to the Dissenters and Ratifying the full and free Toleration they had by Law, and guarding only against the Dissenters their rendering the Law ineffectual, by the Principle and Practice of Occasional Communion, and their undermining thereby the Church of *England*. Both Houses agreed as to the necessity of making the Law of the Sacramental Test effectual, but differ'd as to the manner, and neither of them were for abridging the Liberty of the Toleration. What a wide Inference does your *Remarker* make, that Men are tempted to think that the Factors for a Toleration in *Scotland* are in concert, if they have not a Commission, from those that endeavour to abridge the Dissenters Liberty in *England*, and jointly design to ruin the Presbyterian Interest both there and here. Sir, it was never the way of the *Church of England* to make such concerts with those of the Episcopal persuasion in *Scotland*. The last have been now under fifteen years oppression without any endeavours used to procure them a legal Toleration. But that the Dissenters in *England* & the Presbyterians in *Scotland* may be in a Combination to undermine the Church of *England* seems far more probable, not only, for that they did so once already under the Combination of a Solemn League and Covenant, which they judge to be still binding upon them and their Posterity; but, for that also, for these several years bygone such measures have been carrying on as have a visible tendency thereto.

You

You know Sir, The Author of the Paper, called, *A Letter from a Gentleman, &c.* Concludes his Letter, by studying to give a frightful Prospect, of what may be look'd for, if once a Toleration be granted, to those of the Episcopal Perswasion, as if nothing were to be look'd for then, but Banishment, Prisons, Scaffolds and Axes. And in the Case, P. 9. it is said, if what has been, may be -----, then this Nation might fear, to have an Hierarchical Tyranny, again set over us, making the State to truckle under it, and to be the Executioners of its Orders; forcing all the People to swear solemn Leagues and Covenants, against their Conscience, or else persecuting them in their Persons, good Name, Estate, Liberty, and all that's dear to them; making the Scaffolds to reek with the Blood of the Nobility and Gentry, as they have done with their Fathers and Grandfathers, should they be allowed to advance forward to the height of 49. but that better things are now to be hop'd for from them. Since the experience of the madness of former Times, may make us all more wise and sober. The Remarker p. 28. will needs touch this String again, and will have the Author of the Case, *to have written so many Falshoods, that he is weary of searching them out, and so foully to have represented things, that he has no extraordinary name of Ignominy, and an ordinary one he will not give it.* What was said in the Case, I have here repeated: And as to the Truth of it, I would ask these Questions: Was it not an Hierarchical Tyranny, for the Church Assembly's, to require all the People to swear the National Covenant, and the solemn League, under the pain of Excommunication? Were not the Ministers who refus'd it, depriv'd of their Offices, defam'd in their good Name, as Malignants and Enemies to the Cause of God? &c. Were not they who were excommunicated, immediately pursued for the Confiscation of their Moveables, and the Minister of the Parish where they lived, ordered so to do? and they being declared disobedient to the Laws, were they not forc'd to flee? when the Nobility and Gentry, who took Arms for their King by His Commission, and to defend themselves from this Tyranny and Oppression, were made Prisoners of War, did not the General Assemblies and Commissions, Petition the States to do justice upon them, and give them Thanks, when they had put them to Death? Was not this the Dialect of the Pulpit, that vile, perjur'd, excommunicated
 Traitor

Traitour, *James Grame*? Was there not a Commission ordered to sit to Act always in Conjunction with the State? Did not the Church remonstrate against the Orders of the State and Prohibit the Ministers to read the Declarations of the State, but to read their Remonstrances and require the People not to Obey the State? Did they not compel the Nobility and Gentry who had been at the Engagement for the Kings rescue, to humble themselves for it in Sack-cloth before them? And is there any thing less true than what the *Remarker* says p. 28. That Prelacy has had Thousands of Presbyterians Sacrificed to it in Scotland? Sir *George M'kenzie* in his Vindication of the Government in Scotland during the Reign of King *Charles the II.*, has sufficiently confuted the malice of this Calumny, and made appear That no Man in Scotland under that Reign ever suffered for his Religion. But if any will pretend, that Religion obliges him to rise in Arms, to declare the King has forfeited his Crown, that it is Lawful to Kill him and all who serve him, this principle cannot justify their Crime: And that the Presbyterian Ministers themselves, Zealously ptest Sir *John Dalrymple*, then Advocate, now Viscount of *Stairs*, to hang Mr. *Renwick* (as was done) a Field Preacher, for Field-preaching, where some of his hearers were Arm'd, because he was like to divide their Church, after they got an Indulgence from King *James*, against the accepting whereof, *Renwick* and his Party Exclaimed highly, for that many of them, who then accepted an Indulgence from a King professedly Popish, had rejected it, and Preached against those who accepted of one, when offered by a King of the Protestant profession. And as to the Severity of one Decision, why, says he p. 23, do they Reproach the Government for it, who do yet sustain those abominable ones that were executed, without the least shadow of Justice, against the Marquesses of *Huntly* and *Montrose*, President *Spotswood*, *Haddo*, and Seven Hundred Gentlemen more, who died by their Justice Court, when their Covenant overruled Law and Equity; and against Four Hundred and Fifty Gentlemen and Commons who died by the Justice Court of *Argyle*, beside the many Thousands who died in the Civil War (of which they must be guilty who raised it, and who never yet made the least profession of Repentance for it.) Nor did there Die, saith he p. 17. upon any publick account Twelve in all that Reign of King *Charles*

Y

the

the II. fo exclaim'd against as Bloody, and not one died for any Principle in Religion, unless it be thought a Religious principle to die for actual Rebellion. And tho' says he, p. 24. above 20000 had been guilty of publick Rebellion, yet 200 died not by the Criminal Court, and above a 150 of these might have saved their Lives, by saying, God Bless the King. And as he says, p. 20. There were but two Women executed in the Reigns of King Charles the II. and King James the VI. So those Accusers should remember that it was for higher Crimes than the following of *Montroses* Camp; for which Fourscore Women and Children were Drown'd, being all in one day thrown over the Bridge at *Linlithgow* by the Covenanters, and Six more at *Elgin* by the same Faction, all without sentence or the least formality in Law. And since your friends on all occasions, do calumniate those of the Episcopal persuasion as being for the Despotick Power of Princes, give me leave to add this one passage more of the foresaid *Vind.* p. 25. 'We must also be allowed, saith he, to admire how those who so eminently comply'd with the dispensing Power, in taking an Indulgence from the Papists, and who magnified King James upon that account, as the best of Kings that ever Reigned, should so sharle at us, who in a Parliament, (at which not one of them assisted) refused to take away the Penal Laws made against Papists, whilst many of us resigned our places willingly (as you know Sir George M. did) in defence of those Laws.

As there are many ways whereby we may be partakers of other Mens Sins; so if those things are true which are briefly hinted in the *Case* p. 24 of the Behaviour and actions of the Scots Presbyterians with respect to King Charles the I. I am sure it is no small degree of impenitent Confidence for them (as the *Remarker* p. 26. persists in their name to do) to wash their hands and say with *Pilate*, we are innocent of the Blood of that Person. It would become them better never to omit it among the Causes of their Solemn National Humiliations; and you will do both your self and them a Christian office to move them so to do.

Both Houses of Parliament in England did declare their resolution to stand to, and ratifie the Act made for a Toleration to the Dissenters there, and none more forward than the Bishops. The Commission of the General Assembly in Scotland by a humble Representation to Her Majesties

Majesties, High Commissioner, and the Estates of Parliament there, plead against granting any Toleration to those of the Episcopal Perswasion here; and this Repr. is signed in the name of the Commission by Geo. Meldrum Moderator. For it was not an Enemy that Reproached us, then we could have borne it, but it was thou a Man, our Equal, our Guide and our Acquaintance. We took sweet Counsel, and walked unto the House of God in Company. It is somewhat surprizing to the Episcopal Clergy, and People, (and even to the Moderate Presbyterians) to see their old Fellow Labourer, who went on sweetly in the same Yoke with them in the Episcopal Government of the Church, now lift up the Heel against them, and give in so unkindly a Representation to the High Court of Parliament. But they are desirous to look upon it as an effect of Force rather than Choice, and of the necessity of going along with the Spleen and Humour of a Party, being so flattered, than that Reason or Conscience could suggest such a Representation.

The pretended reasons of the Repr. against a Toleration go upon two heads; One, of there being no just ground to desire or grant it; the Other, of the Consequences of it. For the first, you say, the people have no scruple in their Conscience against Communion in worship with the legally established Church, and did generally wait on the publick worship, where they were not restrained by their masters; till by the practising of some persons they have in some places divided of Late. Sir, you know there are of the Episcopal perswasion as there is of the Presbyterian; some who scruple in their Conscience against Communion in worship with the Legally established Church, and that even of the Laity, & within the City of Edinburgh as well as in other parts of the Kingdom. There are others of them who come to the publick worship of the Presbyterians, not that they are satisfied with it, but rather from their Circumstances than their Choise. And your reasoning is, as if they who had thrust others from a plentiful subsistence, and set them in the Kitchen to feed upon bread, and water, should say, they ought not to have any more favour, because they take what is given them. You know how in the West of Scotland, especially in the two last years of K. Ch. his Reign, except after the Change of the Ministry, the generality of the people there, came to Church and waited on the publick worship.

You

You know how much the principle of occasional Communion prevails in England among the Presbyterians; how much Mr. Corbet, Mr. Baxter, and other Presb. Ministers, did urge Lay Communion with the Church of England, and yet they thought there was just ground to grant a Toleration to the Dissenters there. You see what handle you give to the Church of England to plead against the continuance of a Toleration to the Presb. Dissenters there.

You say; *Neither can the Ministers of the Prelatical way pretend Conscience against joyn't Communion in Worship with you; there being no Sinful Condition of Communion required of them, and it being their constant and known principle, that difference of opinion anent Church Government, is no sufficient reason for separation in worship.* Sir, you know there was no Sinful condition of Lay Communion with those of the Ep. perswasion required of the Presb. Ministers, and it was their known principle and practice, that difference of opinion anent Ch. Gov. is no sufficient reason for separation, and yours too. This you know was also the judgement and practice of Mr. Baxter, and Mr. Corbet, and all the moderate Presbyterians in England: and yet both here and there they pleaded for a Toleration and accepted it when granted. And that the ministers of the Episcopal perswasion have far greater reason so to do, and have withal just Grounds of scruple in Conscience against joyn't Communion in worship, is made appear already. And if you have chang'd your sentiments as to these things now, so may they, and upon more just Grounds.

Your other great Argument is taken from the evil Consequences of it, which I am sure might have been urged with far greater reason both in Scotland and England in the Reigns of K. C. II. and K. J. VII. That the granting a Toleration to the dissenting parties then, in the present Circumstances of the Church and Nation, must unavoidably shake the foundation of our happy Constitution, overthrow these Laws upon which it was settled, needlessly disturb the peace and tranquillity which the Nations enjoyed since the Restauration, disquiet the minds of their Majesties best Subjects, encrease Animosities, Confusions, Disorders and Tumults, weaken and enervat discipline, open a door both to uncurbed vice and to Popery, as well as other Errours, propagate and cherish disaffection to the Civil Government, and bring the Nation under the danger of falling back into the same (or worse) miseries and

and mischiefs under which it groan'd, and from which it was mercifully delivered.

But you say, the *known principles and practices of the party for whom this Toleration is sought do sufficiently demonstrat this*. So, it is not a Toleration to another party, that would bring such mischiefs, but of the Party for whom it is now sought; and this is not said by a Mountaineer, or an inveterate Enemy to them, but by Mr. Meldrum, who was a Minister among them, and knows well their principles and practices, and would not have given this to the supream Court of the Nation, if he could not make good the same.

Pray, Sir, what principles or practices did you observe among them, when you was of their number, that do demonstrat this? Were they for rising up in Arms against their Governours, or did they stir up the People to it? Were they for encouraging of Rabbles and cherishing and propagating disaffection to the Civil Government? were they against the curbing of vice and immorality? What erroneous Doctrines did you hear them Preach? did you observe them to encourage Popery, & not to bear witness against it when the Nation, was under the greatest apprehension of it? pray Sir, speak the truth freely & spare not.

But perhaps, when you say, that to grant a Toleration to that Party, must disturb the peace of the Nation, disquiet the minds of her Majesties best Subjects, propagate and cherish disaffection to the Civil Government, encrease disorders and Tumults, your meaning is, that if this be granted, her Majesties best Subjects, the Presbyterians, will turn disaffected to her Government, and create Tumults, disorders and Rabbles, rather than permit any Toleration to those of the Episcopal perswasion; and it can be hardly understood in any other sense: for those of the Episcopal perswasion will be the more engaged to the Civil Government, and it was never heard that they required any favour received from their Princes, by disturbing their Government, or hissing them off the Stage. And her Majesty and the Estates of Parliament must not do what is just and equal, nor grant any Toleration to so considerable a body of the Nation, lest it give offence to the Presbyterians, her Majesties best Subjects; and if when there is such a Noise for Liberty, those of the Episcopal perswasion, as such, must have none, this is a state of things to which I have no name.

Sir, you conclude your humble Representation with a bold attestation and Threatning of the Estates of Parliament, that in the pre-

sent Circumstances of this Church and Nation, to enact a Toleration for those of that way (which you Pray God of his Infinite Mercy to avert) would be to establish Iniquity by a Law; and would bring upon the promoters thereof, and upon their Families, the dreadful guilt of all those Sins and pernicious Effects, both of Church and State, that may ensue thereupon. That the granting them a Toleration is an Act of Justice and Equitie, has been undenyable made appear. King James's his Toleration it seems was no Iniquity, else you would not have been wanting to have born Wittness against it, far less would you have thank'd him for it. I wish your Brethren may lay to Heart the dreadful guilt they bring upon themselves, of all those Sins and pernicious effects both in Church and State, which they have caused by the fatal Schism they have made in this Church, by the unaccountable and Tyrannical power they have usurpt over their Brethren; by raising and fomenting in the People of their Perswasion, a hatred and aversion to all those who differ from them, as Enemies to God; by making the Terms both of Pastoral and Lay Communion, other than Jesus Christ has made them; by opposing most unreasonably a Toleration to those who cannot accept of these Terms; and thereby heightning the Animosities both in Church and State, instead of following those just and equal measures, that might have served to allay and remove them.

If the present Presb. Dissenters from the Church of England be of the same Spirit and Disposition with some of the former, particularly Mr. Corbet, whose Piety and Moderation you esteem, I am sure they will think, there lies an obligation on you to plead for a Toleration to the Episcopal Perswasion in Scotland, when once they come to understand the Terms both of Laical and Clerical Communion; which I doubt much if Mr. Corbet would have embrac'd, if in order to be a Presbyterian Minister in Scotland, he would have signed the W. Confession as the Confession of his Faith, or would have presented his Children to be Baptised into it as the Summary of the Christian Faith. You know in his account given of the principles and practices of the Nonconformists p. 7. He says: 'We require Subscription or Engagement to no more than the Holy Bible, and if any swerve from the Truth in wicked Errour or Practice, let them be tried and judged by that unalterable Law, which themselves have assented to. And we think this the surest way to preserve the Christian Church, in soundness of Do-

ctrine.

'Grine, Integrity of Life, and Holy Peace. But if the setting forth
 of a publick Confession of Faith, or Articles of Religion be insisted
 on, we allow it as a Rule to Preachers, who may be punishable, if
 they Preach contrary Doctrine, tho' they be not enforc'd to subscribe
 to every Title. And p. 4. 'We still acknowledge the lawfullness of a
 set form of Liturgy, for matter, agreeable to Gods Word, and suited
 to the Nature of the severall Ordinances, and to the necessitie of the
 Church, yet the Minister should not be confined to it, as not to make
 use of his own Gifts of Prayer and Exhortation. And p. 2. 'Chri-
 stianity is most summarily comprehended in the Baptismal Covenant
 of Grace, and more explicitly, yet briefly, in the Creed, Lords Prayer,
 and Decalogue, and at large and most perfectly in the Holy Bible.
 Faith, Hope and Love is the Essence of our Religion, and with us
 differences in things not essential do not make different Religions.
 And p. 6. 'We neither doo nor ever did, renounce the Episcopacy or
 Presidency, which was of an Antient Ecclesiastical Custom, as in the
 time of Ignatius, yea or of Cyprian. And p. 169, *Of the considerati-
 on of the Present State of conformity in the Church of England*:
 'I consent, saith he, to Bishop Ushers model of Government by Bi-
 shops and Archbishops with their Presbyters. --- I am willing, saith
 he, to exercise the Ministry, under the present Ecclesiastick Govern-
 ment, and to promise Obedience to the Ordinary in things Lawful
 and Honest. --- The Antient Conjunction of Episcopacy with Presby-
 terie is that which I wish might be restored to the Church. And p. 57.
Of the Ministry, concerning Ruling Elders, he saith: 'The Query is,
 Whether Christ hath instituted in his Church, such a spiritual Officer as
 this Ruling Elder, who is not Totally nor Finally dedicated to Sa-
 cred Employment, but Statedly left to secular callings, and has no
 Office-power, no nor in *actu primo*, in the Church at Large, but on-
 ly in his own Church, or in such an Assembly as that Church helps
 to make up; nor has he the Power of the Keyes, of Binding and
 Loosing, of Remitting and Retaining Sins, nor is ordained by Prayer
 and Imposition of Hands? I say, Whether Christ hath instituted
 such an Officer? And authoriz'd him in his Name as his Stewart
 to admitt into, or cast out of his Family Church? I find nothing in
 Holy Scripture to warrand his Divine Right; nor can I see in reason
 how one destitute of the above named Capacities, can put forth acts

of Spiritual Discipline, or of Binding and Loosing in Christs name.
 '---The only place that has a shew of mentioning the Ruling Elder
 'in the Church, that is not a Minister of the Gospel, is I. Tim. 5. 17.
 'But this has nothing cogently to evince two different kinds of Offi-
 'cers; but that of those in the same Office, some may be employed
 'more especially in one part of the work thereof, and others in another
 'part, and that the being more abundantly employed in the Word and
 'Doctrine has the Preeminence. ---And Learned Men observe that *τμήν*
 'is maintenance, which is not used to be given to this kind of Officer;
 'for they are such as have secular Imployment to live by.

And as to the Kings Supremacy, and the Doctrine of Passive Obedi-
 'ence, for which your Brethren do so insult over the Episcopal Clergy,
 Mr. Corbet p. 8. of the Account of the Principles and Practices &c.
 'Saieth: 'We acknowledge that Supream Magistrates have a Civil Su-
 'premacie in all Ecclesiastical matters, and a political Episcopacy over
 'the Pastors of the Church in their Sacred Administrations, and may
 'compel them to the Performance of their Duty; and punish them for
 'their Negligence or Mal-administration; that they call Synods, and
 'make Canons, and warrantably thus reform the Church, when it stands
 'in need of Reformation. Accordingly, we acknowledge the Kings
 'Supremacy in all Cases, and over all Persons both Civil and Ecclesia-
 'stical in these his Majesties Realms and Dominions. Moreover, we
 'believe that the Higher Powers are not to be meer Executioners of
 'the Judgements of Ecclesiasticks, but that they may, and must be Judges
 'thereof themselves, in order to their own Execution. And p. 11.
 'When the Higher Powers command what God forbids, tho' we are bound
 'not to perform it, yet we must be subject and not resist, but patient-
 'ly submit to Suffering. The Cause of Religion does not warrant
 'Subjects to take Arms against their Lawful Prince, nor may they by
 'Arm'd Violence, against Authority, attempt the Publick Reformation
 'thereof. We hold, sayes he, that it is unlawful by the Constitution
 'of the Laws of the Kingdom, for any Subject to take Arms against
 'the King, his Office, Authority, or Person; or by Force of Arms to
 'resist any Magistrat or Officer Legally commissioned or authoriz'd
 'by him; yea subjects are bound not only to resist, but to assist and
 'defend their Sovereign with their Estates and Lives: and the Preach-
 'ers of the Gospel ought to teach the People Obedience and Loyalty,
 and

[197]
 and to root out all Principles of Seditions, Rebellions and Disobedience. We believe that we are under no Bond or Obligation of acting contrary to these our avowed Principles. And as to the matter of Comprehension and Indulgence, he sayes. p. 31. "A just Latitude of Church state in the established Order, for the comprehending of all those, whose more moderate Principles render them capable of being conjoyn'd in one settled National Government, and for others who by reason of their narrower Principles, cannot enter in such conjunction, a sufficient, yet duly limited Indulgence, are the things which we humbly propose and earnestly desire. Sir, I know the Name and Sentiments of Mr. Corbet will not offend you; and by these you may judge, whether it was becoming to represent the principles of those of the Episcopal persuasion in Scotland so odiously, and to plead against the granting of any Legal Toleration to them."

Is it not sad that Mens eyes are not opened to behold the miserable and distracted Estate of this Church, and how they drive it on to its ruine? We have lost Christianity, and we strive about forms of Church Government. We have lost the Sword, & we contend which of us has the best Sheath. We have banish'd the Love of God and of one another, and we dote about questions and strifes of words and opinions, & modes of Government, to no profit, but to our unspeakable Hurt and Damage. *Make the Tree Good, and so will the Fruit be; but if the Tree be Evil, the Fruit will be Evil also. Salt is Good, but if the Salt has lost its Savour, wherewith shall it be salted.* Let the Ministers of Religion be first Good Christians, and then they will learn to be good Ministers; then will they teach the People truly what it is to be a Christian; and to do this in Plainness and Sincerity is a matter of no small moment. The time is come *that Men cannot endure sound Doctrine*, for they are generally unwilling to part with their Lusts. 'Tho' they know (saith an Excellent person) that without Holiness 'no man shall see the Lord, yet they cannot endure that severe Doctrine, which teaches that Holiness is inconsistent with a free Indulgence to our Lusts; They abuse the Doctrine of the Imputation of Christs Righteousness and reject such sound Doctrine, as represents the absolute necessity of denying our Selves, and renouncing our own wills &

desires, and obeying all the Laws of Jesus; as derogatory to his Perfect and Complete Righteousness, and as Legal and not so agreeable to the Gospel. Being Proud and Haughty, and having no small conceit of their own Knowledge, they dislike and distaste every Doctrine which agrees not with their sett of Thoughts and Opinions, and with the form of Knowledge which they have imbibed; and Superciliously reject it as False and Erroneous: Such Doctrines as represent to us the several Offices of a Christian Life are despised, and considered by them as fit only for Babes, not for such advanced Christians as they take themselves to be. They are too full of Malice, Wrath and Indignation against those who are not of their way: or who have at any time appear'd against it, and so cannot be pleased with any thing said by them. Finally, they do but Superficially Read and Study the Holy Scriptures, and do not penetrate into the true Sense and Meaning thereof, but content themselves with the sound of some words, scattered up and down, and pervert these to their own great hurt & damage. In a word, no Doctrine pleases them but such, as does one way or other serve them, for upholding a false conceit in their minds, of the safety of their State and Condition, and for maintaining in themselves the Hope of a Blessed Eternity, tho' they walk after the Flesh and fulfill the Lusts thereof. These are the words of the Deceased Mr. Laurence Charters, in the fourth of his Discourses lately published, under the Title of *the Difference between True and False Christianity*. And this you know is a Temper that prevails much in the World, and the Ministers of Religion cannot do a greater Mischief to Christianity, and the Souls of Men, than to give them such a Scheme of Religion as may gratifie this Temper, & make them believe they may be good Christians, tho' they be *Lovers of their own Selves, Covetous, Proud, Boasters, Malicious, Revengeful, Haters of others*, &c.

It were most desirable, that the Ministers of Religion did by Word and Deed, Plainly & Distinctly teach the People the *Essentials* of the Religion of Jesus Christ, such as, without which, our Lord tells us, *we cannot be his Disciples: we cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven: we cannot see God: all other things will profit us nothing*; And clearly to distinguish these from the less necessary, the accidental, the circum-

circumstantial and the accessory things, and not to blend or confound them together, or to makethem think they are good Christians, while they are zealous for the last and neglect the first; but on the contrary to let them see: that *tho' they had all Faith, and gave their Bodies to be burned for Presbytery or Prelacy, and have no Charity, it profits them nothing*; and that if they want the Properties of Charity recounted by S. Paul I. Cor. 13. they have not the essence of it. If this were truly minded and laid to Heart, it would stir up People to mind the one thing necessary, make them look into their own Hearts and consider if they are really Christians themselves; it would sweeten their temper towards others, and make them bend their zeal against themselves, their corrupt nature, their own Lusts and Passions, and leave off judging and censuring of others, but judge themselves. Whereas the contrary practice leads Men into the most dangerous delusions, makes them think they are good Christians, while their Temper and Life is quite contrary to the Spirit, Life and Laws of Jesus Christ; that they are in a justified State, while they still seek to please their Appetites and Passions, puffs them up with a Vain and Proud conceit of themselves and a contempt of others; makes them think they have a great zeal for God; while they are zealous for the opinions and forms of their own party, and vehemently contend for them, and makes them *take up with a form of Godliness, denying the power thereof*.

Sir, Nothing is more disagreeable in writing, than a bold Outfacing of the Truth; a willful misrepresentation of things and impertinent Banter. I would not therefore have applied to consider the *Remarks &c.* if this occasion had not offered of addressing you about them, being hopeful that you will consider things impartially without respect to a Party, and so may come to see that your Brethren the Episcopal Clergy, have mett with unequal and unjust measures, and that your Presbyterian Brethren ought to have given them a more kindly and Brotherly Treatment; which both the Laws of Jesus Christ, and the real interests of the Church and Kingdom do require. Pardon the length of this Paper (which the adducing the Testimonies of so many worthy Persons; has occasioned) and if there by any thing

In it that may seem at first displeasing: for all proceeds from a hearty concern for the true Good of this Divided and Distracted Church and Kingdom, which can never be well settled, but upon the unchangeable Laws of Righteousness, Goodness and Truth: May these Rule our Hearts and Lives; and then our Debates and Animosities will lie away as Night and Darkness do before the Sun.

I am,
Reverend Sir,

Sept. 30. 1763.

Your affectionate & humble Servant

